On the cover: Residents cross San Leandro Boulevard to reach the San Leandro BART Station in downtown.
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Executive Summary
Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan Update
Executive Summary

Bicycling and walking are low-cost, quiet, environmentally friendly, and healthy forms of transportation; ideal for many trips. In 1997, the City of San Leandro adopted a Bicycle Master Plan to set forth a blueprint for completing a system of bikeways, support facilities (such as bicycle parking) and education programs. This document was updated in 2004 and again in 2010 to reflect changes in the bicycling environment and to add a pedestrian component.

This document comprises the 2018 update to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. This Plan supports San Leandro’s General Plan, 2035 General Plan, to guide the development of facilities to enhance bicycling and walking as a safe enjoyable, efficient, and practical transportation choice for San Leandro residents. Specifically, the City’s vision is for:

A city where walking and bicycling are fully integrated into daily life, providing environmentally-friendly transportation alternatives that are both safe and convenient for people of all ages and abilities.

San Leandro has many qualities favorable to bicycle riding and walking, including a temperate climate, flat terrain, and scenic recreational resources along the Bay and hills. Based upon field review and input from City staff, the public, and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), this update identified several issues that currently deter walking and bicycling in San Leandro. These include:

- **Traffic**: High traffic volumes, speeds and significant truck traffic on arterials and collector streets and high speeds and cut-through traffic on neighborhood streets are not conducive to a comfortable bicycling environment.
- **Roadway Width**: Limited available roadway width, especially on arterials and larger streets, can make it challenging to create spaces that provide separation for individual modes.

- **Barriers**: Barriers limit the number of comfortable streets that pedestrians and bicyclists can use to cross. Barriers in San Leandro include: railroad corridors and freeways that limit roadway network connectivity and present difficult conditions at crossings. Major roadway crossings at unsignalized intersections can also be barriers for bicyclists.

- **Sidewalk and Pavement Conditions**: Bicyclists are challenged by poor roadway and pavement conditions. Broken or missing sidewalks and intersections without pedestrian curb ramps can also limit pedestrian accessibility. Vehicles parked on rolled curbs can also limit accessibility and access and can be a barrier.

- **Turn Lanes**: The presence of right turn lanes, especially free right turn lanes, intrude on the bike facilities when present. Free right turn lanes also make crossings more difficult for pedestrians. Similarly, left turns can be especially difficult for bicyclists to navigate as they typically have to cross multiple lanes of vehicular traffic.
Providing Facilities for All Types of Bicyclists: Currently, most bikeways in San Leandro are not comfortable or inviting facilities for all types of bicycle riders as they provide minimal or no separation from vehicles.

Connectivity to Destinations and Surrounding Facilities: Some bicycle and pedestrian facilities do not connect to adjacent facilities and developments, limiting and discouraging access by active modes.

Lighting: Certain areas in San Leandro lack sufficient levels of lighting at night, which can cause both safety (visibility) and security issues for all road users.

Pedestrian Crossings: Pedestrian crossings, especially at mid-block and uncontrolled intersections, can be difficult for pedestrians to navigate without crossing enhancements increasing their visibility. Broken and missing curb ramps and unmarked crosswalks can also be barriers for pedestrians. Marked crossings can also serve bicyclists who wish to make left turns without merging into traffic.

Bicycle Parking: Limited secure short and long term bicycle parking throughout the city and at major destinations discourages bicycle trips as riders need to feel comfortable parking their bicycles.

Bicycles

Existing bicycle facilities in San Leandro include shared-use paths (Class I), on-street striped bike lanes and buffered bike lanes (Class II) and on-street signed bike routes (Class III). This plan also recommends bicycle boulevards, an enhanced version of a bicycle route (Class III) and separated bikeways (Class IV). These facilities are described in more detail in Chapter 3.

The City has approximately 43.4 miles of existing bikeway facilities consisting of:

- 5.2 miles of Class I shared-use paths
- 23.2 miles of Class II bike lanes
- 1.3 miles of Class II buffered bike lanes
- 13.7 miles of Class III bike routes

Improvements identified to meet these needs were organized into bikeway network improvements, spot improvements and bicycle parking improvements. In total, an additional 37.3 miles of bikeways are proposed, which would almost double the current total. Table 1 shows a breakdown of these proposed facilities. The Plan also identifies 41 spot improvements that include enhancements to existing facilities to better define the bikeway network, increase its accessibility, and improve its safety. Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bikeway Classification</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed**</th>
<th>Total**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>11.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>26.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Buffer</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>18.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Bicycle Boulevard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td>14.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class IV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Corridor*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not included in total. Study Corridors are streets that require additional study (parking occupancy, traffic, intersection, etc.) and public input before bikeway decisions can be made.

** Totals include the lengths of existing bikeways proposed to be upgraded.
for a bike share program and locations for additional short and long-term parking have also been developed.

Bicycle-related policy changes related to educational programs, enforcement, maintenance, and other areas are provided in Chapter 5 of the Plan.

**Pedestrians**

San Leandro has nearly 200 miles of roadway, which corresponds to a widespread adjacent pedestrian network. The state of the pedestrian network varies greatly throughout the city. Much of the city is a very walkable and pedestrian friendly environment, composed of small blocks, complete sidewalks, street trees and accessibility features. However, there are areas of the city that are missing sidewalks, street trees, or accessibility features. Additionally, barriers such as railroad crossings, wide intersections, and free right turn lanes, limit the connectivity of the pedestrian network.

This Plan evaluates and presents the existing pedestrian network and future improvement strategies at three levels: Citywide, Pedestrian Improvement Areas, and Pedestrian Key Locations.

**Citywide Improvements** include:
- ADA Transition Plan
- Sidewalk surface assessment and repair
- Curb ramp upgrades to meet ADA standards
- Signal upgrades to meet Accessible Pedestrian Signal Guidelines
- Updated push buttons on pedestrian activated signals
- Implement, maintain and enforce parking restrictions at intersections and crosswalks (daylighting)
- Implement streetscape enhancements
- Utilizing the new Crosswalk Improvement and Scoring Policy
- Studying the removal of free right turn lanes, also known as slip lanes
- Improving access to transit

Eleven *Pedestrian Improvements Areas* are presented in the Plan. These areas were chosen for their proximity to important destinations, need for connectivity improvements, or potential for future development. Seven of these areas were previously identified in the 2004 Plan and four are new to this update. They include:

1. San Leandro Marina
2. Westgate Center
3. Kaiser Development Area/The Spine
4. Manor Boulevard
5. Washington Avenue
6. Downtown San Leandro BART Station
7. East 14th Street Corridor
8. Bancroft Avenue/Dutton Avenue
9. Bay Fair BART Station
10. MacArthur Boulevard
11. Estudillo Avenue – I-580 Underpass to Anthony Chabot Park
12. Hesperian Boulevard

**Key Pedestrian Locations** identify improvements at specific locations. These areas require further analysis to determine specific design solutions. Twenty-nine locations were identified, including the following:

1. Garfield Elementary School
2. Davis Street/I-880
3. Cherry Grove Park
4. Woodrow Wilson Elementary School/ John Muir Middle School
5. Wicks Boulevard at the Marina Community Center
6. Bonaire Park
7. Pacific Community Recreation Complex
8. Washington Elementary School
9. Corvallis Elementary School
10. Floresta Boulevard/ Monterey Boulevard/ Monroe Elementary School
11. San Leandro Boulevard/ Washington Avenue Intersection
12. McKinley Elementary School
13. Bancroft Middle School
14. East 14th Street/ San Leandro Boulevard Intersection
15. San Leandro High: 136th Avenue/ Bancroft Avenue
16. Washington Avenue/ Lewelling Boulevard and Lewelling Boulevard/ Tropic Court intersections
17. Grand Avenue/ Joaquin Avenue intersection
18. Jefferson Elementary School
19. 150th Avenue/ Hesperian Boulevard/ Bancroft Avenue/ East 14th Street intersection
20. Hesperian Boulevard/ Lewelling Boulevard intersection
21. San Leandro Boulevard/ Park Street/ Best Avenue intersection
22. Freeway Interchanges for I-238, I-580, and I-880
23. Merced Street/ Wicks Boulevard intersection
24. Alvarado Street/ Fremont Avenue intersection
25. I-238/ Hesperian Boulevard underpass
26. Davis Street/ Doolittle Drive intersection
27. Railroad Crossings
28. Dutton Avenue/ Chetland Road
29. Bancroft Avenue/ Oakes Boulevard

IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation plan for bicycle and pedestrian improvements prioritizes the projects using several criteria and identifies potential funding sources. Bicycle and pedestrian projects were rated independently and assigned to an appropriate implementation phase based on their performance in the evaluation process. Cost estimates or ranges were identified for all projects. The highest rated bicycle and pedestrian improvements are also identified. These projects may be implemented in the short-term based on implementation status and available funding. These projects, listed in Table 2 on pages 6 and 7, should be considered for funding in the City’s future capital budgets and are eligible for Measure B, Measure BB, and competitive grant funding.
Figure 1: Recommended Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects
### Table 2 - High Priority Bicycle & Pedestrian Projects

#### Measure B & Measure BB Pass-Through Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Bikeway Class/Ped ID</th>
<th>Description/Location</th>
<th>Conceptual Cost Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>Class III Boulevard</td>
<td>Farnsworth Street (Vining Drive - Purdue Street)</td>
<td>$91,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>East 14th Street (Chumalia Street - Estudillo Avenue)</td>
<td>$11,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class II Buffered</td>
<td>Fairway Drive (Monarch Bay Drive - Alvarado Street)</td>
<td>$356,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class IV</td>
<td>Lewelling Boulevard (Wicks Boulevard - Washington Avenue)</td>
<td>$626,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>Bancroft Avenue (142nd Avenue - 138th Avenue; 136th Avenue - 200 ft S. of Blossom Way; East 14th Street - 136th Avenue)</td>
<td>$62,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>B 7B</td>
<td>Improve Crosswalks at Unsignalized Intersections along East 14th Street</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C14</td>
<td>East 14th Street/ San Leandro Boulevard</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C16</td>
<td>Washington Avenue/ Lewelling Boulevard &amp; Lewelling Boulevard/ Tropic Court</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Woodrow Wilson Elementary/ John Muir Middle School</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C12</td>
<td>McKinley Elementary</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C9</td>
<td>Corvallis Elementary School</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 4B</td>
<td>More Crosswalks on Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Competitive Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Bikeway Class/Ped ID</th>
<th>Description/Location</th>
<th>Conceptual Cost Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>Class IV</td>
<td>Williams Street (San Leandro Boulevard - Neptune Drive)</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>East Bay Greenway (Thornally Drive-W Broadmoor Boulevard)</td>
<td>$3,715,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class II Buffered</td>
<td>Alvarado Street (Fremont Avenue - Davis Street)</td>
<td>$122,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class III Boulevard</td>
<td>Aurora Drive (Polverosa Avenue - Bermuda Avenue)</td>
<td>$104,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class III Boulevard</td>
<td>Fargo Avenue (Farnsworth Street -Washington Avenue)</td>
<td>$51,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class III Boulevard</td>
<td>Manor Boulevard (Wicks Boulevard - Washington Avenue)</td>
<td>$107,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Bikeway Class/Ped ID</td>
<td>Description/Location</td>
<td>Conceptual Cost Estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>Class III Boulevard</td>
<td>Oakes Boulevard (East 14th Street - MacArthur Boulevard)</td>
<td>$95,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class IV</td>
<td>Washington Avenue (Lloyd Avenue - San Lorenzo Creek)</td>
<td>$430,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 6D</td>
<td>Implement the Streetscape Improvements Recommended in the East 14th Street South Area Development Strategy</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 4C</td>
<td>Washington Avenue Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 4D</td>
<td>Washington Avenue/Halcyon &amp; Lewelling Boulevard crosswalks</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 4G</td>
<td>Improve Pedestrian Facilities and Accessibility on Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 4H</td>
<td>Improve Pedestrian Crossings at Farnsworth Street and Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C10</td>
<td>Floresta Boulevard/ Monterey Boulevard/Monroe Elementary</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C13</td>
<td>Bancroft Middle</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C15</td>
<td>136th Avenue/ Bancroft Avenue</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C29</td>
<td>Bancroft Avenue/Oakes Boulevard</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C7</td>
<td>Pacific Community Recreation Complex</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>Washington Elementary School</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 11A</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 1C</td>
<td>Sidewalks and Curb Ramps in the Marina</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Garfield Elementary</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Jefferson Elementary</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Cherry Grove Park</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C6</td>
<td>Bonaire Park</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

Chapter 1
Introduction

Bicycling and walking are healthy, sustainable, and lower cost forms of transportation that can be ideal for many trips. In 1997, the City of San Leandro adopted a Bicycle Master Plan to set forth a blueprint for completing a system of bikeways, support facilities (such as bicycle parking) and education programs. This document was previously updated in 2004 and 2010 to reflect changes in the bicycling environment since the previous document and, also, to add a pedestrian component.

This document comprises the 2018 update to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (Plan) is the official policy document guiding the development of policies and facilities to enhance bicycling and walking as practical, efficient, and safe transportation choices for San Leandro residents, workers, and visitors. It is divided into six chapters that address existing bicycling and walking conditions, goals and policies, the recommended bicycle network and pedestrian improvement areas, safety, education, enforcement, and a plan to guide implementation.

Relationship to Other Plans

A number of current documents were reviewed and summarized to identify policies related to bicycling and walking in San Leandro. These documents included a mix of local, state, regional and federal sources as listed below. Appendix A contains additional details on each of these sources.

Plans, laws and policies that were reviewed as a part of the update of this Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan are listed below:

Local

- San Leandro 2035 General Plan (2016)
- San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (2010)
- San Leandro Next Generation Workplace Districts (2013)
- San Leandro BART Station Access Plan (BART, 2002)

Regional

- San Francisco Bay Trail Plan Summary (2015)
- San Francisco Bay Trail Design Guide (2016)
- San Leandro Creek Master Plan (2017)
- Alameda County Bicycle Plan (Alameda County, 2012)
In summary, these documents support bicycling and walking in the City of San Leandro, neighboring communities, and the region. Bicycling and walking are recognized as ways to reduce congestion, oil consumption, air pollution, noise pollution, and impacts on climate change as well as improving mobility options and providing opportunities for healthy exercise. The goals of these planning documents are consistent with the goals, policies and recommendations outlined in the 2018 update of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan focused on providing a balanced transportation system for the City that meets the needs of all road users: people walking, biking, rolling, and driving.

Conformance with Funding Requirements

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan conforms with the California Active Transportation Program. In 2013, California Senate Bill 99 and Assembly Bill 101 were signed by Governor Brown creating the Active Transportation Program (ATP). Administered by the California Transportation Commission, ATP consolidates existing federal and state transportation programs, including the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), and State Safe Routes to School (SR2S), into a single program. Funding is distributed competitively at the statewide and MPO level.

The most recent ATP guidelines do not require applicants to have a Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan that meet certain standards per the former Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) program, however a plan that adheres to the grant program guidelines will help the City prioritize the most competitive projects for funding requests (an ATP compliance checklist is provided in Appendix C). Meeting these guidelines may also help the City advance project implementation through Transportation Development Act (TDA), Measure B, and other funding sources.
Community Involvement in Development of the Plan
The City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) advised City staff and the consultant team in development of the Plan. The BPAC includes 11 members: one City Council-appointed member from each of the six Council Districts and five at-large members. The 2018 Plan Update was discussed at four BPAC meetings. Two of these meetings were combined with Public Open Houses where the public and BPAC members could directly interact with project consultants and provide comments and feedback.

Additionally, an online survey was conducted to gather additional public feedback from a broader audience. The survey was distributed through a variety of means, including Next Door, The San Leandro Times, Facebook advertisements, and City's email lists from the BPAC and Recreation and Human Services. Almost 1,100 responses were recorded, or 1 in 80 San Leandro residents. Additional Plan feedback was collected through the City's Virtual City Hall (Peak Democracy) and through comments on Next Door.
Existing Conditions Outreach

Winter Community Open House/BPAC Meeting

The first Community Open House/BPAC meeting was held in February 2017 in the Sister Cities Room at San Leandro City Hall. This meeting was centered around gaining public input on existing walking and bicycling conditions. City and consultant staff collected input on the existing pedestrian and bikeway networks; examining gaps in the systems, problematic intersections, places where increased separation/protection was desired, how the public accessed transit, and where they had safety concerns. Attendees also had the opportunity to share their feedback on the goals and policies that the City should include in the plan update. Over 30 residents attended this meeting.

As is shown on the following page, attendees were also given the opportunity to share their "BIG IDEA". These "BIG IDEAS" included a wide range of ideas and concepts including: building the East Bay Greenway, closing network gaps, more Class IV bike facilities, bike share, improved street lighting, and many others.

Online Survey

In the time between the two Community Open House meetings, an online survey was opened to gather additional input from the public. The survey, hosted on SurveyMonkey, was advertised on a variety of platforms including Next Door, the San Leandro Times, and the City’s Recreation and Human Services email list. Ads were also purchased on Facebook and Instagram to further grow the reach of the advertising. Over 1,100 survey responses were recorded; a participation rate roughly the equivalent of 1 in 80 San Leandro residents!

The survey provided valuable insights into the direction the public wanted their bicycle and pedestrian networks to go: towards a more connected and “all ages and abilities” network. The survey also allowed respondents to provide comments/suggestions about specific corridors and intersections.

Comments from the first Open House and the survey provided insights that played a pivotal role in crafting the proposed bicycle and pedestrian recommendations (discussed in Chapters 3 & 4). Figure 2 provides a spatial view of areas throughout the City that the public has voiced concerns about. A summary of the survey highlights results can be found in Figure 3.

One of the Facebook ads that was used to advertise the survey and the social media-only incentive.
Community Open House & BPAC Meeting, February 2017

A family shows off their BIG IDEA at the first Public Open House in February 2017: “Open the ‘East 14th Boulevard’ from Downtown northwards.”

Participants log comments and suggestions on plotted maps.

A San Leandro resident discusses some ideas with City Senior Transportation Engineer Reh-Lin Chen (left).

BART Director Rebecca Saltzman makes her BIG IDEA known about improving transit access: “Get rid of pedestrian beg [actuation] buttons around BART stations.”

A family shows off their BIG IDEA at the first Public Open House in February 2017: “Open the ‘East 14th Boulevard’ from Downtown northwards.”
Figure 2: San Leandro Barriers to Walking and Bicycling
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Survey Results & Comments
Figure 3 provides a high-level summary of the tabulated survey results. Throughout the survey, respondents had multiple opportunities to leave open-ended text responses.

COMMUTING
- Of all BART commuters that live within 1 mile of a station (San Leandro or Bay Fair), over half use active transportation to reach the station
  - 47% walk to their BART station
  - 12% bike to their BART station
- 38% of BART commuters that live within 1 mile of a station access the station via private vehicle
  - 24% drive alone to their BART station
  - 13% carpool their station
  - 1% use a ride-sharing service (i.e. Lyft and Uber)
- Of commuters who take the bus to work, 88% of these users walk to the bus

WALKING & BICYCLING
- 27% of respondents do not bicycle in San Leandro
- 1% of respondents do not walk in San Leandro
- 46% of respondents believe that their bike would be unsecure on a U-rack in San Leandro
- Only 32% of respondents would allow their child to walk or bike alone in San Leandro

The Majority of Comments Focused on the following Five topics:
1. Need for additional/better (more separation from vehicles) bike lanes & the desire for a stronger/more connected network
2. Complaints about speeding cars/poor traffic safety/heavy traffic/ and poor driver behavior
3. Complaints about poor sidewalks and pedestrian crossings
4. Residents reported feeling unsafe at night and had concerns about crime
5. Complaints about poor road/pavement conditions and the need for improved roadway maintenance
Figure 3: Pedestrian & Bicycle Survey Highlights

The Results Are In...

What was the survey about?
A survey was conducted to gather feedback and comments from the public about walking, biking and accessing transit in San Leandro.

Who took the survey?
The survey was hosted on SurveyMonkey and was promoted through NextDoor, the San Leandro Times, Facebook advertisements, and through both the City’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, and Recreation and Human Services email lists.

We received almost 1,100 survey responses or 1 in 80 residents. Responses were received from a diverse array of residents across racial, age, and socio-economic groups.

How do people access transit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do people get to work or school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How safe and comfortable do you feel walking and biking in San Leandro?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comfort Level</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Safe &amp; Comfortable</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe &amp; Comfortable</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe &amp; Uncomfortable</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unsafe &amp; Uncomfortable</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you let your child walk or bike alone?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How secure do you believe your bike would be on a U-rack?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Level</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsecure</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spring Community Open House/BPAC Meeting

After analyzing the existing conditions and plan goals and policies, recommendations for the pedestrian and bicycle networks were proposed at the second Community Open House. Recommendations were crafted to improve safety, close gaps in the networks, and move San Leandro towards an all ages and abilities network. The second Community Open House/BPAC meeting was held in May 2017 at Marina Community Center off of Wicks Boulevard. The focus of this open house was gaining feedback on an early draft of the proposed project recommendations. During this meeting, the public, members of the BPAC, and City staff provided comments on the proposed bikeway network improvements. Over 20 residents attended this meeting.

Comments from the BPAC

The City’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee is a valuable resource for both City and consultant staff to learn and gain critical feedback about walking and bicycling in San Leandro. In addition to having conversations and discussions with these members, staff also reviewed annotated maps, detailed comments and emails, and other forms of feedback from BPAC members and local bicycle and pedestrian advocates/organizations including Bike East Bay and Bike Walk San Leandro. Specific comments from the BPAC included: creating safer routes to schools, bicycle facilities with more separation from moving vehicles, closing gaps in both the pedestrian and bicycle networks, improve pedestrian access to San Leandro BART, and ensuring that crossings are updated with accessible technology for those with mobility impairments.

At the second Open House, attendees had the opportunity to “pin” locations where there are pedestrian concerns. Red pins indicate speeding problems, yellow indicates crossing concerns, green indicates lighting concerns, and blue indicates areas where drivers struggle to see pedestrians.

The BPAC discusses existing conditions with consultant staff after the Open House.
San Leandro residents learn about bikeway classifications and bicycle boulevard treatments at a station during the second Community Open House.

Residents “pin” problematic intersections and areas for pedestrian access and mobility on a large map.

A resident decides where to cast his votes for preferred bicycle boulevard treatments.

BPAC members, City staff, and members of the public listened to a presentation by consultant staff on proposed bikeway recommendations.
Project Setting
San Leandro is located in the East Bay of the San Francisco Bay Area between the City of Oakland (to the north) and the unincorporated communities of Alameda County to the south (San Lorenzo, Ashland, and Cherryland) and east (Castro Valley). To the west, San Leandro has more than three miles of shoreline on the San Francisco Bay. The city covers approximately 15 square miles and is home to more than 80,000 residents. In terms of terrain, San Leandro is relatively flat, making walking and bicycling throughout the city accessible for a wide array of users. In addition to local recreation, schools, shopping, entertainment and employment destinations, the city has a number of regional attractions including the Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline, San Leandro Marina, segments of the Bay Trail, Anthony Chabot Regional Park, and Bayfair Center. San Leandro’s activity generators are described below. A map of San Leandro’s land uses is presented in Figure 4 on the following page.

Activity Generators
Major activity centers have the potential to attract the greatest number of trips, including those made by bicycling and walking. The location of these key destinations, and their proximity to transit, are used as a guide in predicting the important or needed routes of travel for bicyclists and pedestrians and, thereby, used in prioritizing where bicycle and pedestrian improvements can serve the most users. The major activity centers in San Leandro are shown on Figure 5. The following discussion of the major activity centers includes:

- Schools
- Community and senior centers
- Public libraries
- Major employment centers
- Downtown San Leandro
- Parks
- City government services
- Retail destinations
- Bayfair Center
- Kaiser Medical Center
Figure 4: San Leandro Land Uses
Figure 5: San Leandro Activity Generators
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SCHOOLS

Students in San Leandro are served by both the San Leandro Unified School District and the San Lorenzo Unified School District. Following standard practice, elementary schools are located within neighborhoods allowing for short trips to school. The middle schools and high schools serve progressively larger geographic areas. Improving safety, accessibility and maintenance of roadways and sidewalks around schools is an important method to encouraging walking and bicycling as transportation to and from school.

In total there are eleven elementary schools, three middle schools and one high school located within the City's boundaries. San Leandro High School was recently expanded to accommodate more students with the addition of the new Fred T. Korematsu Campus. Additionally, there is one continuation high school, Lincoln High, and an Adult School Community Education Center, both of which are centrally located in the city.

COMMUNITY & SENIOR CENTERS

The City of San Leandro Department of Recreation and Human Services offers a wide range of services to the local senior community. Senior programs and activities are provided at the Marina Community Center located on Wicks Boulevard and at the Senior Center on East 14th Street.

In addition to offering senior services, the Marina Senior Community Center provides space for a number of public and private community events. To complement this facility, the San Leandro Boys & Girls Club, located on Marina Boulevard at San Leandro Boulevard, provides a venue for all boys and girls of San Leandro to come together as a community.
PUBLIC LIBRARIES
There are four branches of the San Leandro Public Library distributed around the City. The Main Branch, located on Estudillo Avenue east of downtown San Leandro, is the largest library in the system. The renovated building includes a nicely landscaped open space, and new in-roadway crossing warning lights and a pedestrian actuated flashing beacon on Estudillo Avenue. The Manor Branch is located on Manor Boulevard within the Washington Manor Neighborhood retail district. This branch is the most recently renovated facility including sidewalk improvements and a new in-roadway crossing warning lights installation with a pedestrian actuated flashing beacon on Manor Boulevard. The Mulford-Marina Branch of the public library is located at the intersections of Fairway and Aurora Drives. The South Branch of the public library is located at the intersections of East 14th Street and 148th Street.

PARKS
The San Leandro park system includes 23 parks and recreation facilities including community and neighborhood parks, swimming pools and sports fields. Small neighborhood parks are located throughout the City. Additionally, a number of small parks are located adjacent to elementary schools and contain play structures. There are four larger parks within the City that provide a variety of sports fields. Marina Park, located adjacent to the San Francisco Bay, is the largest city park and provides a wide variety of recreational facilities including paths for walking and bicycling. Many of the paths are part of the San Francisco Bay Trail network.

CITY GOVERNMENT SERVICES
Major city government services in San Leandro that would attract pedestrians and bicyclists include the San Leandro City Hall and the San Leandro Police Department. Both of these services are located on East 14th Street at the north end of downtown San Leandro.

RETAIL DESTINATIONS
There are numerous retail destinations scattered throughout San Leandro. Improving pedestrian and bicycle access to/from retail destinations is important in encouraging walking and biking.

Downtown San Leandro: Downtown San Leandro is a major retail, and increasingly employment, destination and includes a number of independent restaurants and retail businesses, as well as branches of major retail chain stores. Recent, significant upgrades to the San Leandro Plaza include a number of pedestrian improvements. The Pelton Center is another shopping plaza located in downtown San Leandro that includes a number of smaller independent retail businesses and restaurants. The recent and continuing development of the Tech Campus west of San Leandro BART Station has and will continue to bring new jobs to the area.

Bayfair Center: Bayfair Center is a regional shopping mall and major retail destination, located adjacent to the Bay Fair BART Station. Bayfair Center includes key anchor stores such as Macy’s, Kohl’s, and Target as well as restaurants, a movie theater and weekly farmer’s market. The Bay Fair area is currently undergoing the development of transit oriented development (TOD) plan. This plan will improve connectivity to the Bay Fair BART Station, affect the area’s existing land uses and improve pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the area.

Westgate Center: Westgate Center is a large retail, office, and light industrial complex located on Davis Street adjacent to I-880. The shopping center contains a number of major anchor stores including Walmart, The Home Depot and Office Depot. Costco is located across Davis Street. Westgate Parkway was extended in 2006 between Timothy Drive east of the Wal-mart driveway and Williams Street, providing new vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle access.
Greenhouse Marketplace Shopping Center: Greenhouse Marketplace is a local shopping destination located adjacent to the I-580 and I-238 interchange. Greenhouse Marketplace includes a Safeway, Longs Drugs and a number of smaller chain businesses.

Marina Square Center: Marina Square is a large shopping center located east of I-880 at the Marina Boulevard exit. Marina Square has a number of large-scale retail outlets, including Nordstrom Rack, Gap and Old Navy.

Marina Auto Mall: Many of the city's auto dealerships are along Marina Boulevard in the area around the Marina Square Center.

MAJOR EMPLOYMENT CENTERS
San Leandro has a very strong employment base. Traditionally this base has been comprised of food service and manufacturing businesses. Recently, due to its convenient location to freeways, major roadways, and transit, the City has attracted more office/high-tech businesses. There are two large manufacturing and industry areas, west San Leandro and south of Marina Boulevard, which house a number of large-scale businesses. These areas have not typically been priority areas for pedestrian or bicycle improvements and need improvement. Creekside Plaza is a multiple-building complex with over 234,000 square feet of office space located at the corner of Davis Street and San Leandro Boulevard. This complex was strategically located adjacent to the downtown San Leandro BART Station to encourage transit ridership. Earlier in 2017, a new tech office complex opened directly behind the BART Station, further increasing the amount of transit-oriented offices. A second, neighboring building, is currently under construction.

Next Generation Workplace Study, Merced Street is slated to become the focal point of a new business center; connecting the Westgate Center, Marina Square, Kaiser Medical Center, and any future developments in the area of the city.

Figure 6 display's San Leandro's employment density overlaid with its activity generators.
Figure 6: San Leandro Employment Density & Activity Generators

**SAN LEANDRO ACTIVITY GENERATORS**

**DESTINATIONS**
- School - Total Enrollment
- Open Space/Park
- Civic/Government
- Library
- College
- Shopping
- Entertainment
- Hospital
- Medical
- Airport

**EMPLOYMENT**

Total Jobs per Sq. Mile

- 1 - 600
- 601 - 2,350
- 2,351 - 5,300
- 5,301 - 9,400
- 9,401 - 14,700

Map produced: May 2017
Data source: City of San Leandro, ESRI, U.S. Census/LEHD, Ed-Data

CITY OF SAN LEANDRO BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN MASTER PLAN - 25
Multimodal Connections
San Leandro is centrally located in the East Bay and is well served by bus and BART. Transit connection opportunities are discussed below.

BART
Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) operates rapid rail transit service throughout the San Francisco Bay Area. Three BART lines—Richmond-Fremont, Fremont-Daly City, and Daly City-Dublin/Pleasanton—provide service to the two stations in San Leandro: San Leandro and Bay Fair stations. Both stations are well-used (San Leandro has slightly higher ridership than Bay Fair), and provide both vehicle and bicycle parking for riders.

Downtown San Leandro BART Station: The Downtown San Leandro BART Station is located at 1401 San Leandro Boulevard between Davis and Thornton Streets at the edge of Downtown San Leandro. New transit-oriented development (TOD) is slated to continue in the vicinity around the station. San Leandro BART is also planned to be the southern terminus for AC transit’s Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Line, now under construction.

The station includes outdoor bicycle racks with storage for approximately 171 bicycles. Twelve key-operated and 68 electronically operated rental lockers provide additional secure, covered bicycle storage. The key-operated lockers are available only for long-term rentals and require users to complete an application/rental agreement. The electronic lockers, which are operated with a pre-purchased smart card, offer short-term storage and are available on a first-come, first-served basis. There are also spaces for 91 bicycles on bike racks.

The downtown San Leandro BART Station is presently accessible from the City bikeway network via bike lanes on San Leandro Boulevard, Alvarado Street, and Williams Street. The bike lanes on Williams Street extend approximately two miles to the west of the BART station while the bike lanes on San Leandro Boulevard extend approximately ½ mile to the north and south of the station. The bike lanes on Alvarado Street exist only in the immediate vicinity of the station. A number of additional bikeways are proposed to serve the station including extensions to these existing facilities, which would greatly bolster the station’s bicycle accessibility. These proposed routes include the East Bay Greenway trail along the Union Pacific Railroad/BART right-of-way, an eastward extension of bike lanes along Williams Street, and additional bike lanes on Davis Street.

There are two sets of Union Pacific railroad tracks in the immediate area, the Niles Subdivision and the Oakland Subdivision; these are barriers for pedestrians accessing the station. Station entrances should be studied for repositioning to better avoid these conflicts.

While there has been recent lighting improvements along San Leandro Boulevard, pedestrian lighting still needs to be improved on east-west streets to improve connections between the station and downtown commercial areas.

Figure 7 on the following page displays the existing bikeways, within San Leandro BART’s catchment area.
Figure 7: San Leandro BART Nearby Bikeways

SAN LEANDRO
EXISTING
BICYCLE
NETWORK

EXISTING BIKEWAYS
- Bike Lane (Class II)
- Buffered Bike Lane (Class II)
- Bike Route (Class III)

Map produced: August 2017
Data source: City of San Leandro, ESRI, Alameda County Open Data
**Bay Fair BART Station:** The Bay Fair BART Station is located at 15242 Hesperian Boulevard immediately south of the Bayfair Center shopping mall. The Bay Fair area is currently developing a new transit oriented development plan. The Bay Fair Station has outdoor bicycle racks with capacity for approximately 42 bicycles. The station also has 20 electronically operated bicycle storage lockers, which operate under the same terms and conditions as those at the Downtown San Leandro BART Station.

The station is presently accessible from the city bikeway network along Hesperian Boulevard. Additionally, a bicycle/pedestrian connection exists between the Bay Fair BART Station and Bayfair Center. Bicycle access from the unincorporated areas east of the station and internal bicycle circulation between the two sides of the station are less clearly demarcated. The aforementioned East Bay Greenway trail would create an additional opportunity for bicycle and pedestrian access to the station and surrounding area.

---

**AC TRANSIT BUS SERVICE**

Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit) operates local bus service throughout Alameda and western Contra Costa Counties as well as transbay bus service into San Francisco and San Mateo Counties.

The core AC Transit route along East 14th Street is under construction for conversion to full bus rapid transit (BRT)—which includes stations with off-board fare collection—between Downtown Oakland and the Downtown San Leandro BART Station. Currently, the BRT will stop at Davis Street and terminate at San Leandro BART. There is a potential for an expansion to extend the route to Bay Fair BART. As BRT is implemented, effective bicycle connections to BRT stations will become increasingly important. Generally, these stations would be well served by existing and planned bikeways along Peralta Avenue, Davis Street, Estudillo Avenue, and in the vicinity of the Downtown San Leandro BART Station.

All AC Transit buses have front-mounted racks with a capacity of two bicycles. AC Transit commuter coaches, which are used on select transbay routes, have the capacity for an additional two bicycles in the below-seat cargo bays when front racks are full. Certain commuter coaches on transbay routes operating to San Mateo County can hold up to four bicycles in cargo bays. Provided that they do not block seats or aisles, folding bicycles are allowed onboard AC Transit buses at any time.

Figure 9 shows AC Transit routes that run through San Leandro and the boardings and alightings at each stop.
Figure 8: Bay Fair BART Nearby Bikeways
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Figure 9: AC Transit Routes and Ridership
Collision Analysis

Collision analysis is a critical component of the existing conditions analysis. As a part of this plan update, collision analysis was conducted of both pedestrian and bicycle collisions within the five year period of 2011-2015. Figure 10 on the following page provides a map of pedestrian and bicycle collisions in this period. Table 3 provides this data in tabular form.

Collisions were also analyzed to determine high-injury corridors. While collisions were reported throughout the City, several corridors were observed to have a higher density of collisions including Davis Street (State Route 112), East 14th Street (State Route 185) and Hesperian Boulevard.

Reducing collisions and improving safety is one of the primary goals of this plan. Many of this plan’s goals (discussed in the next chapter) work towards addressing safety concerns: Goals 3, 4, and 6.

Safety and collisions are discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

Collision Summary

- Between 2011-2015, there were 51 reported bicycle-involved collisions
  - There was one bicyclist fatality during this period
  - Only one of these collisions did not result in an injury to the bicyclist
- Between 2011-2015, there were 82 reported pedestrian-involved collisions
  - There were five pedestrian fatalities during this period
  - There were a total of 80 injuries (including the fatalities) reported

Table 3 - Collision Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collision Type</th>
<th>Total Collisions</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
<th>Severe Injuries</th>
<th>Minor Injuries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle-involved collisions</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian-involved collisions</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 10: San Leandro Collisions Map: 2011-2015
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Goals & Policies

Chapter 2
Goals & Policies

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan contains goals and policies for developing and implementing a bikeway system and pedestrian improvements that can meet the City’s vision for:

A city where walking and bicycling are fully integrated into daily life, providing environmentally-friendly and healthy transportation alternatives that are both safe, convenient, and practical for people of all ages and abilities.

These goals and policies are outlined below.

**Goal 1: A Comprehensive System: Support the development of a comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian transportation system that links residential communities with local and regional destinations and transit hubs in order to reduce motor vehicle trips.**

**Policies:**

1.1 Work to ensure that all streets in San Leandro are pedestrian and bicycle-friendly for those of all ages and abilities.

1.2 Update the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, part of the City’s General Plan, every five years to identify existing and future needs and provide specific recommendations for facility and program improvements and phasing.

1.3 Include updates to the Bicycle and Pedestrian project lists as part of the larger annual Capital Improvement Project (CIP) update that the City undertakes for all projects.

1.4 Ensure that the Plan is consistent with all existing city, county, regional, state, and federal policy documents.

**Goal 2: Funding & Implementation: Develop, prioritize, and implement improvements that maximize the amount of bicycle and walking trips, given the amount of funding available to San Leandro.**

**Policies:**

2.1 Identify current local, county, regional, state, and federal programs that would fund bicycle and pedestrian capital improvements and programs, along with specific funding requirements and deadlines.

2.2 Identify non-governmental funding sources for bicycle and pedestrian capital improvements and programs such as non-profit or foundation grants, public-private partnerships, and community organizations.

2.3 Pursue multi-jurisdictional funding applications with Alameda County, neighboring cities and other potential partners such as BART and the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD).

2.4 Develop a prioritized list of bicycle and pedestrian improvements along with detailed cost estimates, and identify appropriate funding sources for high priority projects.

2.5 Encourage the formation of reliable local, regional, and state funding sources that can be used to leverage federal funds.

2.6 Estimate and measure the benefits related to an increased mode share of bicycling and walking, such as reduced energy consumption, congestion and parking demand, reduced road wear, and improved air quality and opportunities for healthful exercise, to make the City competitive in applying for grants.
2.7 Project analysis of impacts to level-of-service (LOS) and vehicle-miles-traveled (VMT) should be consistent with the policies outlined in San Leandro's General Plan: San Leandro 2035.

2.8 Maximize funding by implementing projects as a pilot and/or with road resurfacing projects.

2.9 Work with the BPAC to define/develop meaningful metrics that the City can work towards achieving.

Goal 3: Bikeability: Develop a safe and well-connected bicycle system that meets the needs of commute and recreation users of all skill levels.

Policies:

3.1 Increase citywide bicycle mode share to 2% by 2023

3.2 Develop a bikeway system that safely connects residential neighborhoods to employment and shopping areas, transit stops/stations, schools, recreational facilities and other destinations.

3.3 Build upon the existing bikeway system to provide a comprehensive city-wide network that provides connections to facilities designated by Alameda County, East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD), regional agencies, and adjacent communities.

3.4 For the bikeway system, balance user convenience with safety concerns. Where needed, develop a dual system that serves both the experienced and inexperienced bicyclist utilizing low-volume streets and off street multi-use trails.

3.5 Encourage the use of existing natural and man-made corridors such as creeks, shorelines, railroad corridors, and other open space corridors for future multi-use trail alignments.

3.6 Address barriers to bicycling, such as lack of secure bicycle parking, lighting, signal detection, visibility/site line limitations and highway interchanges.

3.7 Conduct bicycle and pedestrian counts and surveys to gauge the effectiveness of various improvements and programs.

3.8 Launch a bike share system (an expansion of Ford Go Bike or an independent system) that helps close the first-last mile gap with transit, increase access to bicycles, and further promote it as a viable and practical mode of travel.
Goal 4: Walkability: Create a safe and well-connected pedestrian environment by improving the walkability of all streets in San Leandro through planning, implementing, and maintaining pedestrian-supportive infrastructure that meets the needs of all users.

Policies:

4.1 Improve connections in the pedestrian network, and provide a high level of service to pedestrians on all streets.

4.2 Ensure safe pedestrian connections between important community destinations, such as residential areas, transit locations, schools, senior centers and other activity generators.

4.3 Increase connectivity and access across barriers to walking such as incomplete or uneven sidewalks, sidewalk obstructions including cars parked on sidewalks, trail gaps, wide intersections, highway interchanges, railroad crossings, and poor connections to transit stops.

4.4 Develop a citywide pedestrian wayfinding (directional signage) system.

4.5 Ensure that sidewalks and other pedestrian facilities meet the principles of universal design and meet legally mandated and best practices requirements for accessibility.

4.6 Provide adequate street furniture and accessible public restrooms to foster an inviting pedestrian environment, where appropriate.

4.7 Ensure adequate light levels for all pedestrian environments.

4.8 Encourage the vibrancy of pedestrian environments by maximizing opportunities for placemaking, landscaping, and street trees.

4.9 Provide intersections with minimal crossing distances (compact intersections), pathways, and frequent crossing opportunities that are safe, accessible, functional, and useful.

4.10 Utilize best practices guidelines for marking pedestrian crossings at controlled and uncontrolled locations. The City recently developed a new Crosswalk Prioritization Policy. This policy sets forth how the City should prioritize making enhancements at pedestrian crossings at non-signalized intersections and mid-block crossings wherever necessary. The City should utilize this policy when reviewing crossings in Pedestrian Priority Areas and when enhancements are requested by the public.

4.11 Install and maintain accessible pedestrian signals adhering to ADA installation guidelines and the latest best practices at all intersections.
Goal 5: Maximize bicycle and pedestrian access to transit.

Policies:

5.1 Ensure that the bicycle and pedestrian systems serve all multi-modal stations.
5.2 Provide pedestrian amenities and safety measures such as bus shelters and wider sidewalks at major transit stops.
5.3 Work with local and regional transit agencies to install bike racks and lockers (or expand existing installations) at transit stops and stations. Bicycle parking facilities should meet current best practices standards and be designed to serve current and future stop/station users.
5.4 Improve bicycle and pedestrian connections between the Downtown San Leandro and Bay Fair BART stations and the surrounding neighborhoods, with special attention to the at-grade railroad crossings and connections through the parking lots.

Goal 6: Improve bicycle and pedestrian safety for all users of the road.

Policies:

6.1 Continue to monitor bicycle and pedestrian-related collisions every three to six months and target a reduction rate of 75 percent over ten years.
6.2 Identify existing driver, bicycle, and pedestrian education programs and target future expansions in these programs. Programs should educate pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists of their rights and responsibilities for sharing the road and address potential conflicts between motor vehicles, bicyclists and pedestrians as well as potential conflicts between pedestrians and bicyclists.
6.3 Implement a pedestrian and bicycle safety education program that is taught every three to five years to all school children (kindergarten to 12th grade) and senior adults. Include bicycle rodeos where children are given actual riding lessons in school.
6.4 Continue and expand the system for reporting and responding to maintenance problems on the existing bikeways and sidewalks.
6.5 Develop a Plan that identifies a schedule for maintenance and cleaning of bicycle facilities.
6.6 Continue to prepare Suggested Routes to Schools maps and construct improvements at schools throughout the City to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety.
Goal 7: Education: Improve awareness of the benefits of walking and biking by developing a coordinated public outreach strategy to encourage bicycling and walking.

Policies:

7.1 Utilize the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) as a forum for ongoing discussions concerning bicycle and pedestrian issues. The BPAC should be involved in the monitoring, implementation, funding, and updating of bicycle and pedestrian facilities as well as reviewing other developments/projects that might affect bicycle and pedestrian access.

7.2 Maximize public involvement through workshops and other means such as the City’s website, Next Door, and social media. The City should always strive to gather feedback from a diverse representation of the public and from a variety of road users.

7.3 Update the San Leandro Trails and Bikeways Map, as needed, for public distribution showing bicycle and trail facilities, key destinations, connections to adjoining jurisdictions, transit connections, and bicycling safety information.

7.4 Sponsor annual events such as “Bike to Work Day”, “International Walk and Roll to School Day”, open streets events, and offer walking and bicycling safety courses for adults, families and children.

7.5 Develop an incentive program for City employees to serve as a model to other city employers and the public to encourage walking and bicycling to work.

7.6 Develop a program to recognize employers, organizations or individuals that encourage walking and bicycling as an alternative to driving for trips to work, school or other activities. Similar to Goal 7.5, the City should work towards developing incentive programs (transportation demand management programs - TDM) to help encourage privately employed workers to walk and/or bike to work.

7.7 Provide information and an approach to publicize the advantages and opportunities afforded by walking and bicycling as viable alternatives to the automobile to reduce noise, carbon emissions, and fuel consumption and improve air quality while providing opportunities for healthy exercise.

7.8 Develop strategies that encourage people to bicycle or walk to work/school, for errands and to connect to transit.

7.9 Coordinate efforts with City departments and agencies, Cherry City Cyclists, Bike Walk San Leandro, Bike East Bay, and other relevant organizations.
Goal 8: Land Use & Development: Develop land use policies and development standards that reduce average trip distances and encourage bicycling and walking trips.

Policies:

8.1 Develop procedures for review of new development and redevelopment projects by City staff, with support from the BPAC as needed, to ensure that they meet the goals, policies, and guidelines of this plan.

8.2 Utilize zoning to encourage development that incorporates a mixture of uses, including residential and local-servicing-retail/employment, to promote walking and bicycling.

8.3 New developments should be accessible to bicyclists and pedestrians with wide sidewalks, compact intersections, integrated pedestrian circulation, bikeway facilities and bicycle parking, and follow legally mandated and best practices requirements for accessibility. New development should include secure bicycle parking for residents and employees.

8.4 Provide pedestrian and bicycle connections between new developments and surrounding commercial and residential areas to accommodate both residents and visitors following design guidelines presented in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines.

8.5 Provide age-appropriate pedestrian and bicycle connections to schools when designing circulation systems in future development.

8.6 When reasonable, keep new block lengths 500 feet or shorter with frequent controlled intersections.

8.7 In new developments, maintain easements for bicycle and pedestrian access where cul-de-sacs or limited points of vehicle access are part of the development design.

8.8 New development should provide an internal pedestrian circulation plan that includes a connection to the public sidewalk. New commercial development should have at least one major entrance on a public sidewalk. If the building is setback from the street, a well-defined pedestrian path should be established.

8.9 Encourage businesses and new developments to make streetscape improvements that promote the use of the street by pedestrians and bicyclists. Support the use of street spaces for outdoor seating, and merchant displays, while maintaining adequate pedestrian access.
Bikeway Network

San Leandro Bicycle Network History

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan sets forth a blueprint for completing a system of bikeways and support facilities within the City of San Leandro. When the Bicycle Master Plan was first adopted in 1997, the City had just 7.4 miles of bicycle lanes on City streets. Currently, San Leandro has an existing bike network that consists of: 5.2 miles of Class I Shared-use Paths, 23.3 miles of Class II Bicycle Lanes, 1.3 miles of Class II Buffered Bicycle Lanes, and 13.7 miles of Class III Bicycle Routes. The combined network consists of 43.4 miles of bicycle facilities; almost double the 25 miles of facilities that existed in 2010. This update builds on the existing bicycle facilities and proposed networks outlined in previous plans, with a focus on accommodating bicycle travel throughout the City and providing access to key employment, school, recreation, shopping and transit destinations.

The following pages provide maps and brief descriptions of how San Leandro has grown and improved its bicycle network in the last several years.

San Leandro has achieved steady growth in their bikeway network since their first Bike Plan in 1997.

A segment of bike lane along San Leandro Boulevard.
2010 Bicycle Network

In 2010, San Leandro had a bicycle network that consisted of 25 miles of bike-ways. At this time, the bike network predominantly focused on bikeways on larger streets such as Estudillo Avenue, Williams Street, Wicks Boulevard, and San Leandro Boulevard. The Class I facilities were trails that were a part of the Bay Trail network.

Table 4 - 2010 Bicycle Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bikeway Classification</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Bike Lane</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Class I shared-use path in the San Leandro Marina Park.
Figure 11: 2010 Bikeway Network
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Map produced: May 2017
Data source: City of San Leandro, ESRI
Existing 2018 Bicycle Network
Between 2010 and 2018, San Leandro’s bicycle network experienced a 74% increase, in large part a result of the Bike Network East Project. Consolidating funding from a variety of local, state, and federal sources, San Leandro was able to build an additional 18 miles of bikeways in this seven year period. This expansion was focused in the northeastern part of the City near downtown and the San Leandro BART Station. Many new miles of Class III facilities were added in addition to the City’s first segments of buffered bike lanes.

Table 5 - 2018 Existing Bicycle Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bikeway Classification</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Bike Lane</td>
<td>23.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Buffered Bike Lane</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>13.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Class II bike lane on Merced Boulevard in front of Kaiser Medical Center.
Figure 12: 2018 Bicycle Network
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Bicycle Facilities

Bicycle facilities include bikeway treatments, bicycle parking, self-repair stations, and signage. These elements are described below with additional design detail included in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines. This discussion includes what is currently in use in San Leandro and other options that may be utilized during implementation of the Plan.

Bikeway Treatments

Bikeway planning and design in California typically relies on the guidelines and design standards established by Caltrans as documented in "Chapter 1000: Bikeway Planning and Design" of the Highway Design Manual (2016) and Part 9 of the Manual of Uniform Control Devices (CA MUTCD 2014). In 2015, Caltrans published Design Information Bulletin Number 89 (DIB 89). DIB 89 provides official guidance for Class IV Separated Bikeways. These documents follow standards developed by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO), and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and identify specific design standards for various conditions and bikeway-to-roadway relationships.

NACTO recently released "Designing for All Ages and Abilities," a guide that outlines bikeway treatments that would be considered for riders of all ages and abilities. As San Leandro strives to create an "All Ages and Abilities Network," referencing this guide as it designs future bikeways will help ensure that these facilities serve an array of bicyclists.

This 2018 Plan update did not include an update to San Leandro's Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines. The Alameda County Transportation Commission's Design Guidelines for Central Alameda County provides more up-to-date guidelines and best practices that San Leandro should reference.

Bicycle facilities in San Leandro fall into the following four types which are illustrated on the following pages.
Class I Shared-Use Paths (Trails)

Class I bikeways, also known as trails or shared-use paths, are off-street facilities dedicated exclusively to use by bicyclists and pedestrians. San Leandro currently has 5.2 miles of Class I bikeways.
Class II Bicycle Lanes and Buffered Bicycle Lanes

Class II facilities are on-street bike lanes. These can be a standard size (minimum 5-feet wide), but can also be enhanced with a painted buffer added to the side of the lane for a higher perception of safety or with green paint for higher visibility. The figures below show a standard Class II bike lane as well as a buffered bike lane. There are currently 23.2 miles of Class II bicycle lanes and 1.3 miles of Class II buffered bicycle lanes in San Leandro.

A buffered bicycle lane on Floresta Boulevard.

Standard Class II bicycle lanes.

Class II bicycle lanes with a buffer. The buffer can be installed in various configurations.
Class III Bicycle Routes

Class III bike routes are streets where the travel lane is shared by drivers and bicyclists. Class III routes are typically designated on roadways with low levels of motor vehicle traffic and speeds. Class III routes in California require a “Bike Route” sign and can include additional posted signage that say “Bikes May Use Full Lane” or on-pavement “shared lane” markings, or “sharrows.” There are currently 13.7 miles of bicycle routes in San Leandro.

Sharrows on a segment of Bancroft Avenue near San Leandro High School.
Class III Bicycle Boulevards

Bicycle Boulevards are generally defined as low-volume, low-speed streets that have been optimized for bicycle travel using treatments such as traffic calming and traffic reduction, way finding and pavement markings, and intersection crossing treatments. Further guidance on bicycle boulevards can be found within guidance from NACTO and U.S. Traffic Calming Manual.

A bicycle boulevard in Berkeley with signage, roadway markings, and a partial street closure.

This Class III illustration shows many potential road diet techniques including sharrows, median islands, chicanes, and mini-roundabouts; this illustration is not inclusive of all treatments. Specific treatments should be determined on a street-by-street basis.
Class IV Separated Bikeways

Class IV Separated Bikeways are typically on-street bike facilities that are separated from vehicle traffic by some sort of physical separation such as curbing, plant boxes, bollards, or parked cars. They can provide one-way or two-way travel on either side of the roadway.

A Class IV separated bikeway in Oakland on Telegraph Avenue. This bikeway is separated using both parked cars and bicycle parking.

This Class IV illustration shows various types of separation devices including curbs, automobile parking, flexible posts, and planter boxes.
Other Bikeway Facilities

COLORED BIKE LANES
Colored bike lanes are considered a way to both guide bicyclists through complex intersections as well as to make motorists aware that they are crossing a bike lane. Colored bike lanes are being used by many jurisdictions. (In April of 2011 the FHWA issued an interim approval for the use of green colored pavement in bike lanes.) Green bike lanes tend to be more intensive in terms of materials and maintenance because of the additional paint or thermoplastic needed to establish and maintain the color. Current best practices state the green color should be used for conflict zones, turn pockets, intersection approaches, and other areas where bicyclists and vehicles mix or perform difficult maneuvers.

TWO-STAGE TURN BOXES (BICYCLE BOXES)
In July 2017, FHWA granted two-stage turn boxes interim approval; the California MUTCD adopted this interim approval in August of 2017. Bicycle boxes are intended to aid bicyclists in making left turns, by eliminating the need to cross lanes of vehicular traffic to get into the vehicle turn lane. These can also be useful, because it allows bicycles to place themselves in front of stopped traffic, increasing their visibility for drivers. The bikes then reposition themselves to face the correct direction and then proceed through the intersection on the right side of the road. For example, in the picture to the right, for on-coming cyclists that wish to turn left at this intersection, the bicyclist would stay on the right side, cross the intersection and stop in the box. Then following the arrow, the bicyclist would reposition him/herself and would cross the intersection with through traffic when the signal changes.
PROTECTED INTERSECTIONS & BICYCLE SIGNALS

Protected intersections may be physically protected and/or protected using signal timing. A fully separated bikeway can extend in/through the intersection or can be established with channelized bikeway treatments. These intersections typically require the use of bicycle signals to isolate bicycle movements from conflicting vehicle movements. There are various design options for protected intersections; some are more construction/material intensive than others. Additional guidance on protected intersections can be found in Caltrans DIB 89 and NACTO guides.

INTERSECTION APPROACHES

Ideally, bike lanes should extend to intersections and continue on the other side. However, in certain situations due to limited available roadway width, bike lanes may stop before intersection approaches and may not immediately continue on the other side. In circumstances where existing lanes stop short, the appropriate traffic or intersection study should be completed to determine if lane removal/consolidation can be completed to accommodate the extension of the bike lane. New bike lanes should strive to reach the intersection in its initial design. Detailed intersection guidance can be found in NACTO design guidelines.

CONFLICT MARKINGS

Conflict markings are used to indicate conflict points between bicycles and vehicles. Conflict markings indicated using colored boxes or dashed lines and are typically installed at intersection approaches, driveways, and other locations where roadway conditions change. These markings are intended to increase awareness among all road users where conflicts between the modes are likely to occur.
Bicycle Parking

Secure bike parking is a necessity for promoting bicycle use, especially for utilitarian trips. People will not cycle to shop, work, or school without a safe place to store their bicycle. Bicycle parking, in the form of bicycle racks, is available at public schools, parks and many other trip attractions. The type of bicycle parking provided at a destination should reflect the type of parking demand expected at the location, i.e. whether facilities are needed for short-term or long-term parking. For example, a shopping mall will need short-term parking for shoppers as well as long-term parking for employees. Bicycle parking categories are defined below.

Long-Term Bicycle Parking

This is parking that protects the entire bicycle and its components from theft, vandalism and the weather. Long-term parking is suitable for a few hours of use up to a full day and is usually found at employment or transit centers. Some long-term installations can also be appropriate for overnight parking, if needed. Examples include bike lockers, bike cages or rooms (locked areas with access for regular users), guarded parking areas (such as bike racks near a parking garage attendant), and valet parking (a bike station). Long-term parking is found at the downtown San Leandro and Bay Fair BART stations. Long-term parking requires more space and is more expensive than short-term parking, but provides greater security from theft.
Short-Term Bicycle Parking

Short-term bicycle parking is defined as a bicycle rack to which the frame and at least one wheel can be secured with a user-provided lock. This type of parking is appropriate for short-term parking such as at shopping areas, libraries, and other places where the typical parking duration is about two hours. Short-term bicycle parking is usually implemented using inverted U-racks or bicycle corrals. Short-term racks should provide two points of contact for the bike, be adequately spaced apart from neighboring racks, and should be sufficiently setback from walls and other street furniture/utilities. In addition, bicycle racks (and the bicycles parked at the racks) should be located outside the typical pedestrian travel path and not conflict with parked cars or passengers entering/ exiting parked vehicles. Bike racks should be placed in a highly visible and illuminated location, and should be within close proximity to the intended destination.

Inverted U-racks are the standard device used to provided short-term parking.

A decorative circular bike rack in San Francisco.

An on-street bicycle corral in Berkeley.
Bicycle Signage & Wayfinding

A good bicycling and walking environment includes both supportive facilities and an easily navigable network. Wayfinding signs and information assist residents, tourists, and visitors find local destinations. Signs may also include “distance to” information, which displays mileage to community destinations.

San Leandro is in close proximity to trails, recreational, and commercial/retail opportunities, such as Bay Trail and Downtown San Leandro. A city-wide wayfinding system and map can raise awareness and improve access for residents and visitors to community assets.

Figure 13: Example wayfinding sign placement. Letters correspond to sign type.
Figure 14 Examples of three types of wayfinding signs: Decision Signs, Confirmation Signs, and Turn Signs.
Existing Conditions

Existing and Future Bicycle Commuter Population

Based on journey to work data from the 2015 American Community Survey: 5-Year Data (2011-2015) (Table 6), it is estimated that 1 percent of San Leandro resident commuters use a bicycle as their primary means of transportation to work. This represents an estimated 370 work based daily bicycle trips. It should be noted that this data does not account for commuters with multiple modes of travel to and from work, such as commuters that ride a bicycle to a BART station before transferring to transit for the remainder of their trip. In these surveys, such trips would be counted as a transit trip. In addition, the census data fails to capture people who commute by bicycle only one or two days per week. Consequently, it is understood that the number of actual commuter bicycle trips is higher than what is represented here.

This sample of the commuter population represents only a percentage of the total cyclists within the City. Cycle trips made for school, shopping, and recreational purposes often represent a large percentage of total bicycle trips, but are not captured within census based surveys.

The future bicycle commuter population will depend on a number of factors such as the availability of well-connected facilities (bikeway and bicycle parking), population density, and type of future land development. With the current emphasis in San Leandro on transit-oriented development and use of alternative transportation modes for environmental and personal health reasons, it would be expected that the popularity of bicycling would increase at an even greater rate than what has occurred historically. For these reasons, it is estimated that with implementation of the recommended bicycle network, the commuter mode split would reach an estimated 3 percent of the mode share representing approximately 1,200 work-based daily bicycle trips. This should also grow non-work bicycle trips as well.
Table 6 - Journey to Work Mode Share for the City of San Leandro

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work at Home</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source 1990 and 200 U.S. Census; American Community Survey 2006-2008; 2010-2015

Connections to Regional Bikeways & Adjacent Jurisdictions

While bicycle connectivity within San Leandro is the main focus of this plan, connections to the regional bicycle networks and adjacent communities are also important; bicycle trips do not always end at the city limits.

REGIONAL BIKEWAYS IN SAN LEANDRO

There are several routes in the San Leandro bikeway network designated as routes of county or regional significance. When considering improvements and additions to San Leandro’s bicycle network, ensuring connectivity with neighboring jurisdictions is an important consideration. Both Alameda County and the City of Oakland are currently in the process of updating their respective bicycle plans. Working with neighboring jurisdictions is important to help ensure that bike facilities do not stop at city limits and continue into the neighboring area. Improving these inter-city connections can benefit both commute, recreational, and utilitarian trips.

The following list provides projects that were listed in countywide or regional plans. Some projects were listed in multiple plans.

- **Alameda County Bike Plan (2012)**
  - East Bay Greenway
  - Bike facilities on the Bancroft-Hesperian-Fairmont Corridor
  - Bike facilities on the Doolittle-Farallon-Wicks Corridor
  - Bike facilities on the Lake Chabot Road-Estudillo corridor
  - Hesperian Boulevard
  - San Leandro Boulevard

- **Alameda County Transportation Commission Central County Complete Streets Design Guidelines (2016)**
  - Bike facilities on the Bancroft-Hesperian-Fairmont corridor
Alameda County Transportation Commission Multimodal Arterial Plan (2016)
- Bike facilities on the Bancroft-Hesperian-Fairmont corridor
- Hesperian Boulevard
- San Leandro Boulevard

SAN FRANCISCO BAY TRAIL IN SAN LEANDRO
San Leandro contains segments of the San Francisco Bay Trail along the San Leandro waterfront between Oakland to the north and San Lorenzo to the south. The Bay Trail facilities are also included on the Alameda Countywide and Regional Bikeway networks. Most of the Bay Trail consists of Class I bike paths with the exception of a short segment of Class III bike route on Neptune Drive between the Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline and Marina Boulevard. Included in the Bay Trail network are path loops around Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline, Mulford Point, and the Small Boat Lagoon in Marina Park. Much of this alignment has paved or unimproved pathways but most do not meet the standards for Class I shared-use paths. The San Leandro Bay Trail Slough Bridge provides a needed connection for the Bay Trail between San Leandro and Oakland.

SAN LEANDRO CREEK
The San Leandro Creek runs from Lake Chabot westward through the Cities of San Leandro and Oakland into San Leandro Bay. Through a collaborative effort between the two cities and partner agencies such as Caltrans and Friends of the San Leandro Creek, a creek master plan was produced to provide bicycle facilities along and parallel to the creek. The creek was divided into eight segments; Segments 5-8 are located within San Leandro. In San Leandro, the creek master plan primarily proposes on-street bikeway facility improvements, with one segment of Class I facilities along the creek.

A popular segment of the San Francisco Bay Trail in the San Leandro Marina Park.
CONNECTIONS TO ADJACENT JURISDICTIONS

The San Leandro bikeway network was designed, in part, to provide connection to facilities in adjacent communities.

To the north, from west to east, connections include:

- From the bicycle/pedestrian bridge across Oyster Bay, the San Francisco Bay Trail extends north to Oakland on an existing Class I bike path to Airport Drive.
- The existing Class II bike lanes on Doolittle Drive connect to existing Class II bike lanes in Oakland.
- The proposed Class I bike path on the East Bay Greenway will connect to the proposed Class I bike path in Oakland.
- The existing Class II bike lanes on San Leandro Boulevard will connect with proposed Class II bike lanes in Oakland. This segment also connects to a proposed Oakland bicycle boulevard on Apricot Street.
- The existing Class III bike route on East 14th Street will connect with existing Class II bike lanes in Oakland.
- The proposed Class IV bikeway on Washington Avenue will connect with existing Class II bike lanes in San Lorenzo.
- The Hesperian Boulevard Study Corridor will connect to the existing Class III bike route in San Lorenzo. This route is also included on the Alameda Countywide bicycle network.
- The Lewelling Boulevard Study Corridor will connect to the east with existing Class II bike lanes. This route is also part of the Regional and Alameda Countywide bicycle networks.
- The proposed East Bay Greenway (Class I bike path) will continue southeast from San Leandro to connect with the proposed facility through Ashland. This facility is designated on the Alameda Countywide bicycle network.
- The proposed Class IV facility on Fairmont Drive will connect to an existing Class II bike lane in Castro Valley.
- The proposed Class III Bicycle Boulevard on Estudillo Avenue (east of I-580) will provide a connection into Lake Chabot Park.

To the south and east of San Leandro, Alameda County has jurisdiction in San Lorenzo, Castro Valley, and other unincorporated areas. Bicycle planning for these areas is set forth in the Alameda County Bicycle Master Plan for Unincorporated Areas. Although Hayward is not discussed in this section because it does not share a common border with San Leandro, some primary bicycle routes, such as the Bay Trail and Hesperian Boulevard, continue south through San Lorenzo into Hayward. Specific connections from San Leandro going west to east include:

- Existing segments of the Bay Trail continue south along the shoreline through San Lorenzo.
- The proposed Class IV bikeway on Washington Avenue will connect with existing Class II bike lanes in San Lorenzo.
- The Hesperian Boulevard Study Corridor will connect to the existing Class III bike route in San Lorenzo. This route is also included on the Alameda Countywide bicycle network.
- The Lewelling Boulevard Study Corridor will connect to the east with existing Class II bike lanes. This route is also part of the Regional and Alameda Countywide bicycle networks.
- The proposed East Bay Greenway (Class I bike path) will continue southeast from San Leandro to connect with the proposed facility through Ashland. This facility is designated on the Alameda Countywide bicycle network.
- The East 14th Street Study Corridor will connect with existing Class III bike route in Ashland.
- The proposed Class IV facility on Fairmont Drive will connect to an existing Class II bike lane in Castro Valley.
- The proposed Class III Bicycle Boulevard on Estudillo Avenue (east of I-580) will provide a connection into Lake Chabot Park.
EAST BAY GREENWAY

The East Bay Greenway is a proposed 16-mile regional trail facility that will connect Oakland, San Leandro, unincorporated Alameda County, and Hayward. The trail will link the Lake Merritt BART Station with the South Hayward BART Station and the five BART Stations in between. The project route will follow BART’s rail alignment. 12 miles of the project corridor is shared with the Union Pacific Oakland Subdivision, a freight rail line. Two route options (rail-to-trail and rail-with-trail) are being considered. The project is intended to be built as a Class I Shared Use Path facility, wherever right-of-way and conditions allow. The Cities of Oakland, San Leandro, and Hayward, Alameda County, BART, the East Bay Regional Park District, Caltrans and the Alameda County Transportation Commissions are participating stakeholders.

Part of the potential East Bay Greenway alignment shared with Union Pacific. Photo taken between Bay Fair and San Leandro BART Stations, near Washington Avenue.
End of Trip Facilities

Bicycle travel requires a network of supporting amenities in order to be convenient and appealing as an everyday means of transport. Safe and convenient bicycle parking is the most critical end of trip facility. Bicycle self-repair stations provide riders with free and easy access to air pumps and basic tools to perform basic repairs and adjustments. Showers, lockers, and/or changing rooms are practical for long commute rides or changing between cycling and work clothing. These amenities are not just amenities, but can remove barriers (both physical and perceived) for existing and potential bicycle commuters. By giving people options to change/store clothes and clean up, some people may be more inclined to commute by bike. However, much like bicycle parking, these facilities need to be located close to bicycle riders’ destinations.

BIKE STATIONS/HUBS

Bike stations/hubs are a beginning/end of trip facility that at minimum provides secure bicycle parking; but can also provide other services such as showers and changing rooms/lockers, bike repair services, bike rentals, valet parking, and part and accessory sales. Bike Stations have been implemented in a variety of ways across the country and around the world. They can be built-in unattended (no employees), partially attended (staffed 3-4 hours per day), and fully attended (staffed during business hours) formats. Downtown San Leandro, near the BART station should be considered for a bike station. The bike station would bring several bicycle amenities to the Downtown area, which could entice additional bicycle riders, both to work and to BART.

BICYCLE SHOPS

Bicycle shops dispersed throughout the community also play an integral role in all aspects of cycling from fixing a quick flat to keeping one's bicycle in proper riding condition.

PUBLIC SHOWER FACILITIES

While there are no “public” shower facilities for bicyclists in San Leandro, one option that some bicycle commuters do have is to shower at a gym near their destination (these locations are indicated in Figure 15). While this will require the purchase of a gym membership, which can be cost prohibitive for some users, gyms can provide bicyclists with shower and locker facilities where they can change and store clothes. Some municipalities have built public shower facilities or partner with bike stations or gyms that already provide these services to increase their access. The location of new facilities should occur near transit centers and dense commercial/office areas like downtown San Leandro.
BICYCLE PARKING FACILITIES
While discussed in more detail above, parking is one of the most important considerations bicyclists make when planning their journeys. Additional parking facilities are proposed throughout San Leandro. Bicycle parking facilities are proposed at activity generators around the city including commercial centers, parks, and downtown. On-street bike corrals may also be appropriate in areas with high concentrations of bicycle traffic. Some San Leandro schools report needing additional or improved bicycle parking facilities; recommendations for these schools have also been included. These parking recommendations include both short-term parking racks and bike lockers.

Bicycle racks are the main type of bicycle parking available for public use in San Leandro. Although not shown on the map, bicycle racks are provided at each of the public schools. Racks are also located at the major retail centers, libraries, government buildings, and recreational destinations. The two BART stations have both bicycle racks and bicycle lockers.

San Leandro has adopted a bicycle rack program which regulates bicycle rack installation in the public right of way and offers free bike racks in business districts.

SELF-REPAIR/FIX-IT STATIONS
San Leandro currently does not have any bike self-repair stations. These stations allow riders to perform basic repairs and maintenance such as changing a tire, adjusting a seat, and using an air pump using secured communal tools. Self-repair stations can be both outside on the sidewalk or in a park and located inside. This plan proposes seven self-repair stations: downtown San Leandro, Lake Chabot Park, Oyster Bay Regional Park, Washington Manor Library, Bayfair Center, and Lincoln High/Burrell Fields/Marina Square.

Existing and proposed end of trip facilities can be seen in Figure 15.
Figure 15: Existing and Proposed Support/End of Trip Facilities
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Needs Analysis

San Leandro has many qualities favorable to bicycle riding, including a temperate climate, flat terrain, and scenic recreational resources along the Bay and in the hills. Based upon field review and input from the public, City staff and the BPAC, several issues were identified that currently deter bicycling in San Leandro by residents and visitors. These include:

**Heavy Traffic**: Major east-west connectors such as Davis Street, Marina Boulevard, Lewelling Boulevard, and Estudillo Avenue; and north-south connectors such as Bancroft Avenue, Doolittle Drive, San Leandro Boulevard, East 14th Street, Hesperian Boulevard, and Washington Avenue all contain many major intersections and carry high traffic volumes, including significant truck traffic, which are not conducive to a comfortable bicycling environment.

**Narrow Streets**: While many of the major arterials are wide enough for multiple travel lanes, some streets do not have enough width to accommodate the heavy traffic and parking demands while also providing separate lanes for bicycle travel. In addition, many of the collector streets, such as Manor Boulevard and Teagarden Street that would be considered as good bicycling alternatives to the busy arterials, are very narrow for the high volumes of traffic that they already carry.

**Barriers**: San Leandro has many barriers that disrupt the typical grid system. Because of these barriers (three railroad corridors, Interstates 238, 580 and 880), there are limited continuous crossings east-west across the city. Bicyclists are forced to share these access routes with heavy volumes of automobile and truck traffic. While lower volume collectors or residential collectors would be more favorable for bicycle traffic, these streets often do not provide the needed connections across the rail and freeway barriers. Crossings over or under the highways and railroad corridors are generally narrow; many of the freeway interchanges pose additional hazards for bicyclists when navigating traffic at freeway on and off-ramps.

**Pavement Condition**: Maintenance of streets designated for bicycle facilities is particularly important as bicyclists are especially susceptible to potholes and road debris. While some of the roadways in San Leandro are in good shape, poor pavement condition was noted on a large number of streets.

**Right Turn Lanes**: There are many free right and right turn only lanes at intersections in San Leandro. While these lanes may be needed to accommodate traffic volumes at the intersection, they pose a hazard to through cyclists on these roadways. The recommended treatment for a bike lane through an intersection with a right turn only lane would be to provide a through bike lane to the left of the right turn only lane. This configuration has been done at many locations in the City (for example, Williams Street at Doolittle Drive, Westgate Parkway, and Merced Street). Sometimes, a green bike lane is also provided to enhance the bicycle safety at the intersection.

Hesperian Boulevard approaching Thornally Drive near Bay Fair BART.
Facilities for All Types of Bicyclists: There are many types of bicyclists in San Leandro. They vary in skill and in their willingness to ride in traffic, ranging from experienced adult cyclists who will ride on any street, to casual adult or novice cyclists who are intimidated by high traffic volumes and speeds, to child cyclists who often do not have the skills and experience to safely navigate busier streets. The proposed network should consider the needs of all types of bicyclists, providing a combination of arterial routes, bike lanes, local streets, and bike paths; creating an all ages and abilities network by utilizing various types of bikeway facilities including Class IV Separated Bikeways and Class III Bicycle Boulevards.

Connectivity to Destinations and Surrounding Facilities: In order to serve all attractions, a fairly fine-grained bikeway network is needed. It must geographically cover the entire city and provide routes that serve all types of bicyclists. Recognizing that some cyclists prefer the most direct route, accommodation is needed on the major arterials and collectors in addition to providing facilities on residential streets that may be more attractive to other bicyclists. A complete network that serves all types of bicyclists should make connections to employment, shopping, recreation, and school destinations in addition to making links to facilities in adjacent communities.

Bicycle Parking and Other End of Trip Facilities: Secure and convenient bicycle parking is imperative to encourage cycling trips. Some bicycle parking, primarily short-term bicycle racks, is available in San Leandro at schools, parks, government offices, and some retail establishments. More short-term bicycle racks for utilitarian trips and long-term parking for employees are needed throughout the City. The City should look to add other facilities like self-repair stations and incorporate bike stations and other shower/changing facilities with appropriate future developments.

With high volumes of freight traffic, this Class II lane along Merced Street, would not be comfortable or low-stress for many types of bicyclists.
Proposed Bikeway Improvements

Improvements to the bicycle environment as presented in this Plan fall into the following categories:

- Bikeway network
- Spot improvements
- Bicycle parking/end of trip facilities

These are discussed below. Support programs, such as education, promotion and enforcement are discussed in Chapter 5.

The Bikeway Network

The recommended bikeway network is a backbone of primary routes; it is not meant to accommodate every bicycle trip in the City. Once completed, this network would furnish safer and more direct routes for the majority of those bicycling within San Leandro. It considers the range of age, comfort, and skill level of those that chose to travel by bicycle.

The bikeway network is a tool that allows the City to focus and prioritize implementation efforts where they will provide the greatest community benefit. Streets or corridors selected for inclusion in the network should be targeted for specific improvements, such as the installation of bicycle lanes or traffic calming, and should receive regular maintenance, such as sweeping and pavement repair, to keep these roadways in good bicycling condition.

However, it is important to recognize that, by law, bicyclists are allowed on all streets and roads regardless of whether or not they are a part of the bikeway network. Consequently, all streets should be improved for safer bicycle travel when opportunities arise following the guidelines provided in the San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines, MTC’s Complete Streets Checklist, and best practices for bicycle accommodation.

BIKEWAY SELECTION CRITERIA

The proposed system was developed according to the following planning criteria:

Coverage: The system should provide equitable, safe and direct access from all residential neighborhoods to both commute and recreation routes. In essence, the system should provide a bicycle facility within one-half mile of any residential street.

System Rationale: Each link in the system should serve one or a combination of these purposes: recreation, connection, and commuting. Bikeway links should
be continuous with a minimal number of arterial crossings and uncontrolled intersections. Each update to the network should strive to limit and close gaps wherever feasible.

Connection of Employment Centers: Downtown, business parks, major retail, and other employment centers should be accessible from all neighborhoods by a reasonably direct system.

Connection of Schools, Libraries, Parks, commercial/retail areas, and transit centers: Schools, libraries, and parks should be connected to surrounding residential neighborhoods by bikeways. While not serving every residential street, the bikeway system should serve as feeder routes where special safety features can be provided at busy intersections. Additionally, the bicycle network should provide connections to other activity generators including commercial/retail areas, and transit centers such as the City’s two BART stations.

Connection to Regional Bikeways: The bikeway system should allow continuous access to potential regional bikeway routes and routes in adjacent communities, such as the Bay Trail and East Bay Greenway.

Suitability of Bikeway Type: The characteristics of a roadway determine whether that roadway is suitable for inclusion in the network and, if so, what type of facility should be prescribed. Roadway width is a key factor in determining what bicycling improvements can be made. Roadways should also be assessed by traffic speed, volume of car and truck traffic, and roadway hazards. The ages, comfort level, and skill levels of expected bicyclists should be considered. Recommended bikeway cross-sections are illustrated in the San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines.

PROPOSED NETWORK
The proposed bikeway network is illustrated on Figures 16-21. The proposed system includes a total of 37 miles of new bikeway facilities in addition to the 43.4 miles currently in place. Specific improvements will be defined during the design phase for each project following the standards set forth in the San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines. Table 6 shows the number of existing and proposed miles for each bikeway classification. In addition to the bicycle network, spot location improvements and bicycle parking improvements are recommended and discussed below.

Each bikeway was further divided into segments, as needed, to describe the different roadway characteristics and recommended improvements. The proposed improvements by segment are presented in Tables 7-13.

Table 7 - Existing & Proposed Bikeway Length by Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bikeway Classification</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed**</th>
<th>Total**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>11.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>26.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Buffer</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>18.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Bicycle Boulevard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td>14.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class IV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Corridor*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>41.20</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not included in total. Study Corridors are streets that require additional study (parking occupancy, traffic, intersection, etc.) and public input before bikeway decisions can be made.
** Totals include the lengths of existing bikeways proposed to be upgraded.
Class I Shared Used Paths (Trails)

Class I bikeways, also known as trails or shared-use paths, are off-street facilities dedicated exclusively to use by bicyclists and pedestrians. Figure 16 shows the Class I facility recommendations. There are 6.15 miles of proposed Class I facilities.

Table 8 - Recommended Class I Bikeways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Bay Greenway</td>
<td>Thornally Drive</td>
<td>W. Broadmoor Boulevard</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monarch Bay Drive</td>
<td>Flood Control Channel</td>
<td>Neptune Drive</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro Creek</td>
<td>UPRR Niles Subdivision</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo Creek</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>Farnsworth Street</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part of the potential alignment of the East Bay Greenway, which would be a Class I shared-use path.
Figure 16: Recommended Class I Bikeways
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Class II Bicycle Lanes

Class II facilities are on-street bike lanes. These can be a standard size (minimum 5-feet), but can also be enhanced with a painted buffer added to the side of the lane for a higher perception of safety or with green paint for higher visibility. The inclusion of gutter seams when determining the width of bike lanes can be detrimental to bicyclists when bike lanes are less than 6 feet wide, as gutter seams can present additional concerns to bicyclists like additional road debris and uneven surfaces.

There are 3.65 miles of proposed Class II facilities and 4.30 miles of Class II Buffered facilities.

**Table 9 - Recommended Class II Buffered Bikeways**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alvarado Street</td>
<td>Fremont Avenue</td>
<td>Davis Street</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairway Drive*</td>
<td>Monarch Bay Drive</td>
<td>Alvarado Street</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halcyon Drive</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>BART Tracks</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springlake Drive</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No buffer can be provided on the current I-880 overcrossing due to width constraints.

**Table 10 - Recommended Class II Bikeways**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft Avenue*</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>200 ft. S of Blossom Way</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corvallis Street</td>
<td>Ottawa Avenue</td>
<td>Farnsworth Street</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>Chumalia Street</td>
<td>Estudillo Avenue</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden Road</td>
<td>End of Street</td>
<td>Doolittle Drive</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halcyon Drive</td>
<td>BART Tracks</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Boulevard</td>
<td>Superior Avenue</td>
<td>Fortuna Avenue</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Boulevard</td>
<td>Neptune Drive</td>
<td>Doolittle Drive</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced Street/Wicks Boulevard</td>
<td>Fairway Drive</td>
<td>Burroughs Avenue</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro Boulevard</td>
<td>Creekside Plaza</td>
<td>Park Street</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>Caliente Drive</td>
<td>143rd Avenue</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bike lanes are recommended for three segments: East 14th Street-146th Avenue, 142nd Avenue-138th Avenue, and 136th Avenue-200 ft. S of Blossom Way.
Figure 17: Recommended Class II Bikeways
Class III Bikeways

Bicycle Routes

Class III bike routes are routes where the travel lane is shared by drivers and bicyclists. Class III routes are typically designated on roadways with low levels of motor vehicle traffic and speeds. Class III routes in California require a “Bike Route” sign and can include additional posted signage that say “Bikes May Use Full Lane” or on-pavement “shared lane” markings, or “sharrows.” There are 4.64 miles of proposed Class III facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andover Street</td>
<td>Burkhart Avenue</td>
<td>Lewelling Boulevard</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda Avenue</td>
<td>Aurora Drive</td>
<td>Doolittle Drive</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkhart Avenue</td>
<td>Wicks Boulevard</td>
<td>Norton Street</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Avenue</td>
<td>Grand Avenue</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Boulevard</td>
<td>Alvarado Street</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton Street</td>
<td>Washington Manor Park</td>
<td>Burkhart Avenue</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyster Bay Regional Park</td>
<td>Existing trail</td>
<td>Existing trail</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peralta Avenue</td>
<td>San Leandro Boulevard</td>
<td>End of cul-de-sac</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Drive</td>
<td>Williams Street</td>
<td>Davis Street</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 - Recommended Class III Bicycle Routes

An example of sharrows with angled arrows directing riders where the bicycle route continues.
Bicycle Boulevards
Bicycle Boulevards are generally deemed as low-volume, low-speed streets that have been optimized for comfortable bicycle travel using treatments such as traffic calming and traffic reduction, way finding and pavement markings, and intersection crossing treatments. Bicycle boulevards can be used as an alternative to arterials. Additional guidance on bicycle boulevards can be found from NACTO and the U.S. Traffic Calming Manual. This plan recommends 14.31 miles of Bicycle Boulevards.

A bicycle boulevard in Berkeley that has been designed with pavement markings and a striped chicane.

### Table 12 - Recommended Class III Bicycle Boulevards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aurora Drive</td>
<td>Polvorosa Avenue</td>
<td>Bermuda Avenue</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro Street</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Avenue</td>
<td>Merced Street</td>
<td>Corvallis Street</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton Avenue</td>
<td>Farnsworth Street</td>
<td>Juniper Street</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fargo Avenue</td>
<td>Farnsworth Street</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnsworth Street</td>
<td>Vining Drive</td>
<td>Purdue Street</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Avenue - Evergreen Avenue -</td>
<td>Sybil Avenue</td>
<td>Fairmont Drive</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Street - Wake Avenue - Halsey Avenue - Lark Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniper Street</td>
<td>Dayton Avenue</td>
<td>Cedar Avenue</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Chabot Road</td>
<td>Estudillo Avenue</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Boulevard</td>
<td>Superior Avenue</td>
<td>Estudillo Avenue</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>Wicks Boulevard</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakes Boulevard</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>MacArthur Boulevard</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue Street</td>
<td>Crosby Street</td>
<td>Juniper Street</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sybil Avenue</td>
<td>Grand Avenue</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teagarden Street</td>
<td>Fairway Drive</td>
<td>Marina Boulevard</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Broadmoor Boulevard</td>
<td>San Leandro Boulevard</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Avenue</td>
<td>Marina Boulevard</td>
<td>Davis Street</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A bicycle boulevard in Berkeley that has a partial street diverter which allows free access and egress for active modes, but limits access by motor vehicles.

Wayfinding signs can be specifically designed to serve users of bicycle boulevards and direct them to important local destinations.

In Berkeley, bicycle boulevards have modified street signs (standard on bottom, bicycle boulevard on top) that indicates its status as a bicycle boulevard to all road users.
Figure 18: Recommended Class III Bikeways
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Class IV Separated Bikeways

Class IV Separated Bikeways are typically on-street bike facilities that are separated from vehicle traffic by some sort of physical separation such as curbs, plant boxes, bollards, grade separation, or parked cars. They can provide one-way or two-way travel on either side of the roadway. This Plan recommends 8.1 miles of Class IV bikeways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doolittle Drive</td>
<td>Oakland City Limit</td>
<td>Farallon Drive</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmont Drive</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnsworth Street</td>
<td>Corvallis Street</td>
<td>Monterey Boulevard</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewelling Boulevard</td>
<td>Wicks Boulevard</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Avenue*</td>
<td>Lloyd Avenue</td>
<td>San Lorenzo Creek</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicks Boulevard</td>
<td>Burroughs Avenue</td>
<td>Lewelling Boulevard</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Street</td>
<td>San Leandro Boulevard</td>
<td>Neptune Drive</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This is highly complex area of Washington Avenue. Close coordination with Caltrans will be required the next time the interchange is reconstructed.

This Plan recommends Wicks Boulevard be redesigned with Class IV bikeways. On Wicks Boulevard, this design would require minimal to no removal of parking, has few driveway conflicts, provides connections to parks and community centers, and would provide a traffic calming element to a wide street, which would benefit all road users.
Figure 19: Recommended Class IV Bikeways
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Study Corridors

The Master Plan Update also includes several study corridors. These are streets that can be very beneficial to San Leandro's bicycle network (improving access and connectivity), but due to various physical constraints, require additional study before bikeway improvement recommendations can be made. There are **14.6 miles** of study corridors.

Typically due to limitations with available roadway width, studies are necessary to determine whether reductions in street parking, travel lanes, and/or turning lanes that will be necessary to accommodate bicycle infrastructure, will have significant effects to intersection and corridor operations. It is important for both the City and the public to understand the trade-offs that occur when significant changes in roadway configuration occur. These changes may or may not be acceptable to various parties, and thus having an open and public process when considering these changes will be important for successful coordination and implementation of changes to these roadways.

These corridor studies should also take pedestrian considerations into account, studying existing intersections and crossing conditions, and incorporating those enhancements into future corridor designs. Each study corridor has been proposed with a recommended bikeway facility class.

The following eight corridors are listed as study corridors:

- Bancroft Avenue
- Davis Street
- Lewelling Boulevard
- Hesperian Boulevard
- Estudillo Avenue
- Washington Avenue
- Estudillo Canal
- East 14th Street

---

**Table 14 - Recommended Study Corridors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Bikeway Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft Avenue</td>
<td>Durant Avenue</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Street</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>Oyster Bay Park</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewelling Boulevard</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>Lewelling Boulevard</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estudillo Avenue</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>Lake Chabot Park</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>139th Avenue</td>
<td>West Estudillo Avenue</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Avenue</td>
<td>Estudillo Avenue</td>
<td>Sybil Avenue</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estudillo Canal</td>
<td>Bay Trail</td>
<td>Farnsworth Street</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>San Leandro Creek</td>
<td>City Limits (with Ashland)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Complete Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 20: Recommended Study Corridors
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Bancroft Avenue Class IV Study

Bancroft Avenue is a very special 2.7 mile-long cross-town street in San Leandro. Uses along Bancroft are primarily residential, with pockets of commercial. Additionally, four schools (Bancroft Middle, San Leandro High, Jefferson Elementary, and McKinley Elementary) all have frontage along Bancroft Avenue. Bancroft can also serve as a pedestrian and bicycle-focused corridor; this is especially important as East 14th Street increasingly focuses on transit.

From an infrastructure standpoint, though, Bancroft is a complex street that changes widths 12 times (including twice at intersection approaches) to eight different sizes, ranging from a little as 36-feet wide to as large as 62-feet wide (curb-to-curb width).

There is a strong desire from the public, members of the BPAC, and the San Leandro City Council for Bancroft Avenue to provide continuous safe bicycle facilities. A study will be needed to fully understand the impacts and trade-offs that installing Class IV facilities throughout the corridor would have. This Plan recognizes both the strong public desire and the benefits that these facilities can bring to San Leandro residents, especially students at these four and other nearby schools. Below is a diagram that breaks down Bancroft Avenue by its various street widths and adjacent land uses.

To illustrate one of the many possible designs for Bancroft, this Plan provides one potential cross section. The design is based on a two-way, parking protected Class IV separated bikeway. There are many possible Class IV configurations, including both two-way cycletracks and bi-directional separated bikeways. These facilities can be designed with an array of separation techniques, intersection configurations and other design options. Roadway width constraints mean an improvement to bicycle facilities will require trade-offs. Intersection treatments and crossings will need to be designed with great care to ensure safe access into and out of the facility. Careful consideration will also need to be given to how this facility interacts with school drop-off locations. It is important to have an open and robust public engagement process when considering design alternatives. One existing and one potential cross section can be found on the following page.

Diagram not drawn to scale. Diagram does not reflect changes in street width at the intersection approaches to Dutton Avenue and 136th Avenue.
Bancroft Cross Sections

The longest segment of Bancroft Avenue without a width change is between Oakes Boulevard and San Leandro High School. This segment is 56 feet wide, curb-to-curb. This segment includes both Bancroft Middle School, McKinley Elementary School, and part of the San Leandro High campus. The below cross section illustrates the existing conditions on Bancroft Avenue in this segment; it currently consists of parking/loading zones on both sides of the street, one travel lane in each direction, bi-directional Class II bike lanes and left turn/middle turn lanes.

Existing: 56’

The below cross section shows one potential redesign of the same 56 feet wide segment with a two-way Class IV cycletrack on the east side. As mentioned on the previous page, there are many possible design considerations for this potential Class IV facility.

Potential: 56’
DAVIS STREET CLASS IV STUDY

Davis Street, State Route 112, is a key east-west connector at the northern edge of San Leandro. Davis Street also has a heavily used I-880 interchange that has a heavy volume of truck/freight traffic. This study corridor runs between Oyster Bay Park and East 14th Street.

One segment of Davis, between the BART tracks and East 14th Street, could be a continuation of existing bike lanes that stop around the area the Union Pacific and BART tracks. This segment of Davis Street could provide an additional connection from San Leandro BART into downtown San Leandro. The current roadway configuration changes as Davis Street approaches San Leandro Boulevard, as the eastbound travel lane changes from two through lanes and an intermittent turning lane to two through lanes and two left and one right turning lanes. To accommodate bicycle lanes in this segment of Davis Street, a reduction in travel/turning lanes or parking lanes may need to occur.

Another constrained segment of Davis Street is between the BART tracks and Doolittle Drive which provides a connection to the Westgate Shopping Center and improves access to Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline (riders can use Davis, Doolittle, Williams, and Neptune to reach the park). Between west of the BART tracks and east of I-880 interchange, Davis Street has Class II bike lanes. There is potential and good reason to study enhancements to these bicycle facilities to buffered bike lanes or Class IV facilities. This segment of Davis Street can be especially dangerous for bicyclists because of the I-880 interchange and high volume of truck traffic. Highway on and off ramps also pose serious safety and speed concerns for all active transportation users; it is critical that safety, access, and connectivity for these users be considered in the design of these areas.
LEWELLING BOULEVARD CLASS IV STUDY
Currently, Lewelling Boulevard has bike lanes west of Wicks Boulevard to Washington Avenue, providing east-west connectivity and access to the Bay Trail for residents in the Manor neighborhood. However, the bike lanes stop at Washington Ave, as Lewelling approaches a series of interchanges for I-880 and I-238. As Lewelling Boulevard crosses Washington Avenue, the street loses over 10 feet of width, and drops the bike lanes. Extending the bike facilities to the city limits at the Lewelling/Hesperian intersection can provide connectivity to the commercial uses around the intersection and to neighboring San Lorenzo. Because there is no street parking in this area, in order to accommodate bicycle facilities, a travel/turning lane or center turn lane would have to be removed. Because of the highway ramps, extra care should be given to the design of this segment of the street to provide additional safety for active transportation users.

HESPERIAN BOULEVARD CLASS IV STUDY
Connecting to the aforementioned Lewelling Boulevard Study Corridor is the Hesperian Boulevard Study Corridor. There are no bicycle facilities on Hesperian between Lewelling and railroad tracks north of the I-238 underpass. This segment of Hesperian can provide a connection to Bayfair Center and Bay Fair BART Station; linking commercial areas and improving connectivity from San Lorenzo to the Bay Fair area. Hesperian does narrow to get through the underpass, which poses width constraints. This segment of Hesperian between Lewelling and the I-238 underpass is also about 10 feet narrower than north of the underpass; adding bicycle facilities in this segment will require removal of a travel lane.

Future improvements on Hesperian should be coordinated with the currently in-progress Bay Fair TOD Plan. Furthermore, coordination with the South Alameda County Major Corridors Travel Time Improvement Project (AC Transit Line 97), which is scheduled to be implemented between 2018-2019, is equally important.

Hesperian Boulevard, north of the railroad crossing.
ESTUDILLO AVENUE CLASS IV STUDY

Estudillo Avenue is a critical east-west street, connecting the eastern parts of San Leandro to downtown. Estudillo Avenue is primarily fronted by low-density residential uses with pockets of commercial. Bancroft Middle School and one of San Leandro’s libraries also has frontage along the corridor. For San Leandro residents, Estudillo Avenue is also the primary access route for entry to Lake Chabot Park. There are currently Class II bicycle lanes along Estudillo Avenue. In the San Leandro Creek Master Plan, Estudillo Avenue was recommended to be enhanced with Class IV separated bikeways. With limited available roadway width, further study is necessary to understand the trade-offs that would have to be made to accommodate these separated bikeways.

WASHINGTON AVENUE CLASS IV STUDY

Another important cross-town connector is Washington Avenue. This segment (between 139th and West Estudillo) of Washington Avenue is constrained for multiple reasons. North of 139th Avenue, Washington Avenue tunnels under Union Pacific railroad tracks (the same tracks that would be part of the East Bay Greenway). This tunnel does not have any bicycle or pedestrian facilities. Additionally, pedestrian and bicyclists are forbidden from using the tunnel in San Leandro’s Municipal Code (Section 6-5-215); the only such ban in the Code. Providing a safe and efficient route for pedestrians and bicyclists to bypass the tunnel should be studied to improve connections within the area. Given the uncertainty with a timeline for the completion of East Bay Greenway, finding an interim solution for pedestrians and bicyclists to cross the area would close an important gap with both the pedestrian and bicycle network.

North of the tunnel, Washington Avenue is primarily a two-lane roadway with one travel lane and parking lane in each direction and is Class III bicycle route with sharrows. While this segment of Washington may be too narrow to be enhanced with bicycle lanes, there is potential for additional Class III improvements; possibly creating a bicycle boulevard.

After Washington Avenue Crosses West Juana Avenue, Washington runs through and terminates in the shopping center parking lot. Bicycle enhancements in this segment of Washington can be very useful for improving bicycle access to and through the shopping center and Downtown San Leandro.
**GRAND AVENUE CLASS IV STUDY**

The section of Grand Avenue has the potential to become a critical north-south segment of San Leandro’s bicycle network. The Study Corridor covers the segment of Grand Avenue between Estudillo Avenue and Sybil Avenue. Running parallel to I-580, Grand Avenue can become a connector street to various east-west bicycle routes and bicycle boulevards; improving linkages between residential areas, schools (public and private), Lake Chabot Park, San Leandro BART Station, and downtown San Leandro. This part of Grand Avenue would also provide a connection to the proposed bicycle boulevards (Wake Avenue-via 136th Avenue-and Sybil Avenue, for example).

This segment of Grand Avenue is complex as it has on and off ramps for I-580 at three locations in this study corridor. The highway interchange generates a large volume of faster-moving automobile traffic. Further complicating this corridor, is the curb-to-curb width shrinks from about 60 feet to about 30 feet after the EB I-580 on ramps (near Maud Avenue).

**ESTUDILLO CANAL CLASS I STUDY**

The Estudillo Canal is a flood control channel that generally runs east-west in the southern part of San Leandro. There is potential to create a Class I shared use path along the banks of the canal from Farnsworth Street to the Bay Trail. In addition to providing a low-stress east-west connector through the Manor neighborhood, it provides connectivity to commercial areas, residential areas, and the Bay Trail. Creating a shared use path along the canal will require close coordination with multiple public agencies and a detailed engineering study to study feasibility. Class I facilities would have to be carefully designed for both user safety and to ensure the continued functionality of the canal. Additional complications include that west of Inverness Street the canal changes form: west of Inverness it returns to a natural canal and loses the concrete lining, and the trail would also have to navigate an elevated railroad crossing. It should also be studied whether it is feasible and safe to open existing bridges across the canal to further increase access and connectivity. This project could be built in phases as different segments of the canal have different constraints and feasibility concerns.
EAST 14TH STREET COMPLETE STREET STUDY

One of the items that this Master Plan Update puts emphasis on is connections to neighboring jurisdictions. East 14th Street (State Route 185) has great potential to be a crosstown connector. However, it is a very complex street as it changes width/lane configurations multiple times throughout San Leandro. This makes it very difficult to establish continuous bicycle facilities. AC Transit’s East Bay Bus Rapid Transit is currently being constructed and will run along East 14th Street from the Oakland border to Davis Street where it will continue to San Leandro BART. As a part of the San Leandro Creek Master Plan, the segment of East 14th Street between the San Leandro Creek and Estudillo Avenue is proposed to include Class II bicycle facilities.

The remainder of East 14th Street from Estudillo Avenue to the city border with Ashland will need to be studied to determine the feasibility of bicycle facilities. With the street changing widths multiple times, detailed parking, traffic, and intersection studies will be needed to determine the impacts of roadway configuration changes. Additionally, there is potential for the extension of the East Bay BRT corridor, which can further constrain East 14th Street; however, that also creates the potential to create a true multimodal complete street, with transit and active transportation being priority modes. As one of the few continuous streets that runs from border to border across San Leandro, East 14th Street has lots of potential to be a key crosstown street, linking multiple commercial centers, civic buildings, transit, schools, and residential neighborhoods together.

Improvements along East 14th Street in the segments near the Bay Fair Center should be coordinated with the in-progress Bay Fair TOD Plan.

Another study segment of East 14th Street is between Chumalia Street and Estudillo Avenue. This segment was called out in the San Leandro Creek Master Plan as being a Class IV facility. Further study is necessary to determine feasibility and necessary trade-offs.

East 14th Street in front of McKinley Elementary School. This is a narrow segment of East 14th Street and it sees relatively high volumes of pedestrian and bicycle traffic; some of which is driven by nearby schools.
East 14th Street in front of San Leandro City Hall and the Carlton Senior Living facility. (This segment of East 14th Street was recently reconfigured as a part of the East Bay BRT project).
Figure 21: Recommended Bikeway Improvements
Table 15 - Recommended Bikeways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alvarado Street</td>
<td>Fremont Avenue</td>
<td>Davis Street</td>
<td>II Buffered</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andover Street</td>
<td>Burkhart Avenue</td>
<td>Lewelling Boulevard</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora Drive</td>
<td>Polvorosa Avenue</td>
<td>Bermuda Avenue</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft Avenue*</td>
<td>142nd Avenue</td>
<td>200 ft S of Blossom Way</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayfront Drive</td>
<td>Bay Trail</td>
<td>Lewelling Boulevard</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda Avenue</td>
<td>Aurora Drive</td>
<td>Doolittle Drive</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkhart Avenue</td>
<td>Wicks Boulevard</td>
<td>Norton Street</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro Street</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Avenue (Cedar - Hemlock - Ottawa)</td>
<td>Merced Street</td>
<td>Corvallis Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corvallis Street</td>
<td>Ottawa Avenue</td>
<td>Farnsworth Street</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton Avenue (Dayton - Inverness - Fargo)</td>
<td>Farnsworth Street</td>
<td>Juniper Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Avenue</td>
<td>Grand Avenue</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doolittle Drive</td>
<td>Oakland City Limit</td>
<td>Farallon Drive</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay Greenway</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden Road</td>
<td>End of Road</td>
<td>Doolittle Drive</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmont Drive</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairway Drive</td>
<td>Monarch Bay Drive</td>
<td>Alvarado Street</td>
<td>II Buffered</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fargo Avenue</td>
<td>Farnsworth Street</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnsworth Street (1)</td>
<td>Vining Drive</td>
<td>Purdue Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnsworth Street (2)</td>
<td>Corvallis Street</td>
<td>Monterey Boulevard</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bike lanes are recommended for three segments: East 14th Street-146th Avenue, 142nd Avenue-138th Avenue, and 136th Avenue-200 ft. S of Blossom Way.
## Recommended Bikeways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name (Start - End)</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Avenue - Evergreen Avenue - School Street - Wake Avenue - Halsey Avenue - Lark Street</td>
<td>Sybil Avenue</td>
<td>Fairmont Drive</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halcyon Drive (1)</td>
<td>BART Tracks</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halcyon Drive (2)</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>BART Tracks</td>
<td>II Buffered</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniper Street</td>
<td>Dayton Avenue</td>
<td>Cedar Avenue</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Chabot Road</td>
<td>Estudillo Avenue</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewelling Boulevard</td>
<td>Wicks Boulevard</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Boulevard</td>
<td>Superior Avenue</td>
<td>Fortuna Avenue</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Boulevard (Manor - Kesterson - Beatrice)</td>
<td>Wicks Boulevard</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Boulevard</td>
<td>Neptune Drive</td>
<td>Doolittle Drive</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced Street/Wicks Boulevard</td>
<td>Fairway Drive</td>
<td>Burroughs Avenue</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monarch Bay Drive</td>
<td>Flood Control Cannel</td>
<td>Neptune Drive</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Boulevard</td>
<td>Alvarado Street</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton Street</td>
<td>Washington Manor Park</td>
<td>Burkhart Avenue</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakes Boulevard (Oakes - Maple - Dowling - Superior)</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>MacArthur Boulevard</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyster Bay Regional Park</td>
<td>Existing Trail</td>
<td>Existing Trail</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peralta Avenue</td>
<td>San Leandro Boulevard</td>
<td>End of cul-de-sac</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue Street</td>
<td>Crosby Street</td>
<td>Juniper Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro Boulevard</td>
<td>Creekside Plaza</td>
<td>Park Street</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro Creek</td>
<td>UPRR Niles Subdivision</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommended Bikeways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo Creek</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>Farnsworth Street (extension)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springlake Drive</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>II Buffered</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sybil Avenue</td>
<td>Grand Avenue</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teagarden Street</td>
<td>Fairway Drive</td>
<td>Marina Boulevard</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Drive</td>
<td>Williams Street</td>
<td>Davis Street</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Broadmoor Boulevard</td>
<td>San Leandro Boulevard</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Avenue (1)</td>
<td>Lloyd Avenue</td>
<td>San Lorenzo Creek</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Avenue (2)</td>
<td>Caliente Drive</td>
<td>143rd Avenue</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Avenue</td>
<td>Marina Boulevard</td>
<td>Davis Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicks Boulevard</td>
<td>Burroughs Avenue</td>
<td>Lewelling Boulevard</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Street</td>
<td>San Leandro Boulevard</td>
<td>Neptune Drive</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spot Improvements

Several of the existing facilities in San Leandro would benefit from spot improvements to meet current best practices, better define the bikeway network and improve its effectiveness, accessibility, and safety. Spot improvements were divided into four general categories:

- Signage/Marking Improvements
- Intersection Configuration Changes
- Intersection Approach Change
- Design Changes

Each category is described in more detail below; each description is accompanied by a list of locations that require the relevant improvements. Some locations are listed in more than one category. Specific treatments should be considered on a spot-by-spot basis. These areas are based on input from the public, members of the BPAC, and City Staff. The following lists are not all inclusive. As the City reviews new projects and continues its road maintenance program, it should utilize these examples as case studies as more intersections and street segments are found needing similar improvements.

Signage/Markings

Locations in this category are street segments that have existing facilities, but are missing certain design element. These design elements include, but are not limited to: pavement markings (sharrows/lane markings) and signs (Bike Route, Bikes May Use Full Lane, etc.). There are 8 locations in this category. Improving the signage and pavement markings can help increase driver awareness of bicyclists.

SIGNAGE/MARKINGS LOCATIONS

- **Striping/Pavement Markings**
  - Neptune Drive: Oyster Bay Regional Park to Marina Boulevard
  - Monarch Bay Drive: Fairway Drive to southern end of street
  - MacArthur Boulevard: Dowling Boulevard to Joaquin Avenue/Grand Avenue
  - Springlake Drive: Hesperian Boulevard to Loch Lane/Creekside Drive
  - Hesperian Boulevard: Grace Street to East 14th Street
  - Williams Street: Timothy Drive to Westgate Parkway
  - East 14th Street: Broadmoor Boulevard to City Limits
- **Signage**
  - Davis Street at Frederick Road/Gilmore Drive (eastbound)
Intersection Configuration
Locations in this category are areas where the design of the intersection poses accessibility and safety concerns for bicyclists. The majority of these locations have free right turn lanes that complicate the mixing zone area between cars and bicyclists approaching these intersections. Free right turn lanes increase the speed that automobiles can turn and their presence typically means that the bike lane does not continue all the way to the intersection. There are five intersections that should be studied to improve their accessibility and functionality for bicyclists. The City should analyze their roadway network for additional intersections that may need enhancements.

INTERSECTION CONFIGURATION LOCATIONS
- Neptune Drive/Monarch Bay Drive
- Lewelling Boulevard/Washington Avenue
- Alvarado Street/Fremont Avenue
- Wicks Boulevard/Farallon Drive
- Bancroft Avenue/Dowling Boulevard
- Merced Street/Wicks Boulevard

A free right turn lane at the intersection of Hesperian Boulevard and Lewelling Boulevard.
Intersection Approaches

This category of spot improvements addresses bicycle lane markings that do not continue all the way to or start immediately after an intersection or when there is a change in roadway configuration (width change, bus zone, etc.). In many cases, pavement markings (sharrows) can be installed to increase automobile driver awareness of potential changes in bicyclist roadway position and to guide bicycle traffic through the change in roadway conditions. There are 27 locations throughout San Leandro where intersection approaches can be improved for bicycle access and comfort.

INTERSECTION CONFIGURATION LOCATIONS

- Wicks Boulevard/Lewelling Boulevard
- Alvarado Street/Marina Boulevard
- Adams Avenue/Doolittle Drive
- Estudillo Avenue/East 14th Street
- Hesperian Boulevard/Fairmont Drive & Hesperian Boulevard/150th Avenue
- Springlake Drive/Sweetwater Drive & Hesperian Boulevard/Springlake Drive
- Lewelling Boulevard/Washington Avenue
- Estudillo Avenue/Bancroft Avenue
- Westgate Parkway/Williams Street
- Alvarado Street/Aladdin Avenue
- Alvarado Street/Marina Boulevard
- Estudillo Avenue/MacArthur Boulevard
- East 14th Street/Davis Street
- Davis Street/San Leandro Boulevard
- Davis Street/Orchard Avenue
- Williams Street/Washington Avenue
- San Leandro Boulevard/Washington Avenue
- San Leandro Boulevard/Williams Street
- Washington Avenue/139th Avenue to 143rd Avenue
- Marina Boulevard from San Leandro Boulevard to Washington Avenue
- San Leandro Boulevard/East 14th Street
- Wicks Boulevard/Farallon Drive
- Hesperian Boulevard/Halycon Drive/Fairmont Drive
- Floresta Boulevard/Fremont Avenue
- Floresta Boulevard/Washington Avenue
- Fairway Drive/Doolittle Drive
- Lewelling Boulevard/Wicks Boulevard
- Davis Street/ Doolittle Drive
- Williams Street/ Doolittle Drive
Design Change Locations
Locations in this category will typically involve implementing some sort of roadway design change to accommodate improved bicycle facilities or remove a gap in the bikeway network. Each of these four locations has a unique set of characteristics. Solutions should be determined on a site-by-site basis.

DESIGN CHANGE LOCATIONS
- MacArthur Boulevard, between Broadmoor Boulevard and Mitchell Avenue
  - There is a segment of bike lane between two sets of angled vehicular parking. The bike lane starts from and ends into a parking stall.
- Doolittle Drive, between Davis Street and Carden Street/railroad tracks
  - There are bike lanes on Doolittle Drive but they are not present in this segment. Given the complexities of the railroad tracks and bus zone, the design for the continuation of the bikeway will need extra attention.
- Estudillo Avenue (east of I-580)/Lake Chabot Road
  - Bicyclists (and pedestrians) accessing Lake Chabot Park via Estudillo Avenue, need to cross Lake Chabot Road. This crossing is immediately after a blind hilly curve, making the crossing very difficult. A solution for safer park access is needed.
- Foothill Boulevard, from MacArthur Boulevard to City Limits
  - Bike lanes are currently only present on one side of the street. A bike lane for the other direction of travel should be added.

Signals
One way that San Leandro can enhance the bicycling experience and improve network efficiency is by installing bicycle detection at signalized intersections that use actuation. Bicycle detection technology allows bicyclists to alert the signal controller to their presence and desire to travel through a specific intersection approach; providing a similar function to pedestrian beg buttons. There are various methods of detecting bicycles at intersections, but the most common methods are bicycle push buttons and bicycle loop detectors. Bicycle loop detectors work on the same basic principle as vehicle loop detectors and use magnetic waves to detect a bicycle.

As the City continues to upgrade and retrofit intersections with signals that use actuation to control signals, these improvements should include bicycle detection. The City should also consider installing bicycle detection at intersections that handle high volumes of bicycle traffic.

Bicycle loop detection is usually indicated with the above pavement marking.
Bicycle Parking

Bicycle parking is an integral part of any bikeway network. Without secure and convenient bicycle parking, many cyclists will not choose to use their bicycle for trips where stops are made. Currently, bicycle racks are provided by the City, other public agencies, and by private landowners. More bicycle parking is needed within the City, particularly at retail and employment centers, parks, transit stops, and other locations that attract bicycle trips. To meet this need, the following two programs are recommended.

CITY BICYCLE RACK PROGRAM

San Leandro's bicycle rack program provides the City with the means and procedures for installing bicycle racks where they are needed. With this program, the City installs a bicycle rack(s) within the public right-of-way at the request of a community member. This could be a landowner, business owner, resident, or employee. Once the request has been received, City staff visits the requested location to determine if a bike rack can fit, contact adjacent property owners to inform them of the intent to install a bicycle rack, and, finally, install the bicycle rack. The program also provides technical support for property owners wishing to install bicycle racks on private property as well as serve as a clearinghouse for bicycle parking information.

BICYCLE PARKING ORDINANCE

The current San Leandro zoning ordinance regarding bicycle parking specifies bicycle parking be provided at the rate of five percent of the requirement for automobile parking spaces with commercial uses. It is recommended that this requirement be revised as a stand-alone Bicycle Parking Ordinance and expanded to include other land uses (i.e. multi-family residential) and to provide more specific recommendation as to type of bicycle parking to be provided (i.e. short-term or long-term) by land use. The ordinance may also include a reduction in vehicle parking requirements with the installation of a certain number/type of bicycle parking. More detailed discussion of the specifics for a revised bicycle parking ordinance can be found in the San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines including a sample bicycle parking ordinance.

A bike corral in the spot of a couple parking stalls in a Class IV parking separated bike lane: Telegraph Avenue - Oakland.
Bike Share

Bike share systems are a network of public bicycles that residents, workers, and visitors can rent for short periods of time. Bike share systems are put in place to achieve a number of goals and objectives which generally include:

- Help to close first-last miles gaps with transit stops and stations
- Provide access to bicycles for those who do not own them
- Make commuting by bicycle more convenient as system users do not have to worry about parking or storage
- Provide opportunities for healthy recreational activities
- Increase access to commercial and retail locations
- More generally provide residents, workers, and visitors with more relatively low-cost transportation options.

Bike share systems come in a variety of types and sizes and a system can be customized to fit San Leandro's needs. The three main types of bike share systems are:

- Smart dock systems
- Smart bike systems
- Hybrid systems

Smart dock systems are defined by having physical stations as the only places where bikes can be picked-up or dropped-off. These stations can either be in the parking lane of the roadway or on sidewalks/plazas where there is enough space. Smart bike systems are more flexible in that all of the technology related to the system is on the bikes themselves, which allows them to be picked-up and left anywhere within the system's service area. Most smart bike systems do have hubs, which mimic the stations of smart dock system, but these hubs require much less physical space and generally do not require utility access. Hybrid systems combine the flexibility of smart bikes with the more formal structure of smart dock systems. These systems generally incentivize users to return bikes to hubs by offering a slight discount or credit on that ride; this can help reduce rebalancing and system operating costs.

Many cities in the Bay Area have established bike share systems. San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose, and Berkeley are a part of Ford Go Bike, formally Bay Area Bike Share. Other cities like San Mateo and Alameda have or are considering launching their own independent systems.

To determine what type and how large of a system would best fit San Leandro's unique goals, built environment/land uses, and financial situation, the City should conduct a bike share feasibility study. This study will answer the aforementioned questions and can also help guide the system's design if the City chooses to proceed.

A Ford Go Bike station in downtown San Jose.
Pedestrian Network

Chapter 4
Pedestrian Network

The most memorable and sought after pedestrian environments are places where people have the opportunity to slow down, enjoy their surroundings, visit local businesses, and observe or interact with other members of their community. To achieve this status, pedestrian facilities need to be designed to meet or exceed the minimal requirements, and include amenities that encourage and promote walking. Walkability is a qualitative measure of the degree to which a pedestrian network encourages walking. Walkability is influenced by all aspects of the built environment; the availability and maintenance of aspects of the pedestrian network, such as sidewalks, crosswalks, curb ramps, and street trees, the interaction of ground-floor uses and the street/sidewalk, and the availability of pedestrian amenities such as benches and wayfinding signage.

Throughout this document the term “pedestrian” is used to include all persons who utilize the sidewalks and crosswalks regardless of their level of mobility. The goal of pedestrian-oriented design is to meet the needs of all users, regardless of their age, their destination, or if they walk or roll in a wheelchair.

Introduction

San Leandro has nearly 200 miles of roadway, which constitutes an enormous adjacent pedestrian network. The state of the pedestrian network varies greatly throughout the City. Much of the City is a walkable and pedestrian friendly environment, composed of small blocks, complete sidewalks, street trees and accessibility features. However, there are areas of the City that are inhospitable to pedestrians because of lack of or congested sidewalks, lack of street trees, long blocks, and lack of accessibility features. Additionally, there are some major barriers within the City that inhibit the connectivity of the pedestrian network. These barriers include railroad tracks (active and inactive) and freeways (I-238, I-580, and I 880), which run throughout San Leandro and limit the east to west pedestrian connectivity within the city, and also create accessibility and safety limitations.

The City of San Leandro is constantly working to improve the pedestrian environment. A number of major improvements have been made under the 2010 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. These improvements, include safety and circulation improvements around the Westgate Center, improved sidewalks and design features near the Kaiser Development Area, and pedestrian improvements around San Leandro BART Station. This update is designed to identify additional future pedestrian improvement needs and to prioritize their implementation.
Pedestrian Improvement Areas

The City of San Leandro and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) have identified Pedestrian Improvement Areas as areas where walkability is critical and should be improved. This Plan focuses on these Pedestrian Improvement Areas; they were chosen for a number of reasons including proximity to important destinations, need for connectivity and/or accessibility improvements, or potential for future development. A total of 12 Pedestrian Improvement Areas are identified as part of this Plan. Figure 22 illustrates the Pedestrian Improvement Areas.

1. **San Leandro Marina Pedestrian Improvement Area** includes the area along Monarch Bay Drive adjacent to the Marina as well as the neighborhood around Marina Boulevard and Doolittle Drive.

2. **Westgate Center Pedestrian Improvement Area** includes the Westgate Shopping Center, the intersection of Timothy Drive and Davis Street, and the area along West Gate Parkway.

3. **Kaiser Development Area/The Spine Pedestrian Improvement Area** encompasses the location of the Kaiser Permanente San Leandro Medical Center. The area is bounded by Marina Boulevard to the north, Merced Street to the west, Fairway Drive to the south, and I-880 to the east. Merced Street is slated to become the focal point of a new business center (established in the Next Generation Workplace District Study); connecting the Westgate Center, Marina Square, Kaiser Medical Center, and any future developments in the area of the city.

4. **Manor Boulevard Pedestrian Improvement Area** includes the Manor Boulevard corridor from Juniper Street to Washington Avenue. This Pedestrian Improvement Area contains an active neighborhood commercial district and a high volume roadway.
5. **Washington Avenue Pedestrian Improvement Area** is a lengthy corridor that crosses San Leandro and has multiple areas of different character.

6. **Downtown San Leandro BART Station Pedestrian Improvement Area** is bounded by Davis Street to the north, Alvarado Street and the railroad to the west, Marina Boulevard and Estabrook Street to the south, and East 14th Street to the east. The Area expands at its eastern boundary to include the San Leandro Main Library between Estudillo Avenue and Callan Avenue. This Pedestrian Improvement Area includes much of Downtown San Leandro, the Downtown San Leandro BART Station, a number of employment locations, and areas of future development.

7. **East 14th Street Corridor Pedestrian Improvement Area** encompasses the nearly three miles of East 14th Street within the City limits. This Pedestrian Improvement Area serves as a primary local vehicle and transit route, providing access to employment centers, as well as, pedestrian generators such as schools, libraries, and parks.

8. **Bancroft Avenue/Dutton Avenue Pedestrian Improvement Area** encompasses Dutton Avenue from Breed Avenue to Chetland Road, and Bancroft Avenue from Victoria Court to 138th Avenue. The area includes a small commercial district and is a major north-south connector within the City; land uses include retail, residential, and a number of schools.

9. **Bay Fair BART Station Pedestrian Improvement Area** encompasses the BART station, Bayfair Center, and adjacent areas on Hesperian Boulevard and Fairmount Drive. These improvements should be coordinated with the Bay Fair TOD Plan.

10. **MacArthur Boulevard Pedestrian Improvement Area** extends along MacArthur Boulevard from Durant Avenue to Estudillo Avenue. The area incorporates two retail corridor districts and access to and from I-580.
11. **Estudillo Avenue from the I-580 Underpass to Anthony Chabot Park Pedestrian Improvement Area** encompasses Estudillo Avenue from the I-580 underpass to Anthony Chabot Regional Park. This park is a major destination for residents of the City of San Leandro. Currently pedestrian access to the park is limited.

12. **Hesperian Boulevard Corridor** is a key connection from the southeastern part of San Leandro into the Bay Fair Area, providing connections to BART, shopping, and other activity generators. Hesperian Boulevard has a history of a high number of pedestrian collisions, including a fatality. The Bay Fair TOD Plan (under development) includes a proposal for a road diet on Hesperian Boulevard with a bicycle and pedestrian esplanade, that should be strongly considered for implementation.
**Key Pedestrian Locations**

Key Pedestrian Locations are identified as spot locations that warrant special considerations for pedestrians because they pose potential challenges to pedestrians or are located near significant pedestrian destinations and thus deserve special safety precautions. The following are Key Pedestrian Locations that need significant pedestrian and safety improvements. Key pedestrian Locations are also illustrated in Figure 22.

1. Garfield Elementary School
2. Davis Street/I-880
3. Cherry Grove Park
4. Woodrow Wilson Elementary School/ John Muir Middle School
5. Wicks Boulevard at the Marina Community Center
6. Bonaire Park
7. Pacific Sports Complex and Burrell Field
8. Washington Elementary School
9. Corvallis Elementary School
10. Floresta Boulevard/Monterey Boulevard/Monroe Elementary School
11. San Leandro Boulevard/Washington Avenue Intersection
12. McKinley Elementary School
13. Bancroft Middle School
14. East 14th Street/San Leandro Boulevard Intersection
15. San Leandro High School
16. Washington Avenue/Lewelling Boulevard and Lewelling Boulevard/ Tropic Court Intersection
17. Grand Avenue/Joaquin Avenue Intersection
18. Jefferson Elementary School
19. 150th Avenue/Hesperian Boulevard/Bancroft Avenue/East 14th Street Intersection
20. Hesperian Boulevard/Lewelling Boulevard Intersection
21. San Leandro Boulevard/Park Street/Best Avenue
22. Freeway Interchanges for I-238, I-580, and I-880
23. Merced Street/Wicks Boulevard
24. Alvarado Street/Fremont Avenue
25. I-238/Hesperian Boulevard
26. Davis Street/Doolittle Drive
27. UPRR Niles and Coast Subdivisions
28. Dutton Avenue/Chetland Road
29. Bancroft Avenue/Oakes Boulevard

*A crossing guard assists families crossing Marina Boulevard near Garfield Elementary.*
Figure 22: Pedestrian Improvement Areas & Key Locations
Needs Assessment
The City of San Leandro has an extensive pedestrian network requiring constant maintenance and rehabilitation in order to meet the growing needs of its pedestrians. The City contains many roads that were built to primarily serve the automobile, and thus do not provide a high level of pedestrian infrastructure. As a result, there are many locations throughout the City that provide sidewalks without any added features that would encourage walking or help to create a comfortable pedestrian environment. Many of the Pedestrian Improvement Areas contain neighborhood commercial centers or other destinations such as schools and parks that are visited on a daily basis. These areas need pedestrian amenities and upgrades to encourage walking and the creation of a safe and inviting environment.

Throughout the City, many sidewalks, crosswalks, and curb ramps need to be upgraded to meet current ADA standards. ADA standards have evolved since many of the original accessibility improvements were implemented, and the City is working to make these upgrades to meet current standards. In many cases meeting ADA standards is a complex task because of the limited spatial resources.
Recommended Improvements

Recommendations for citywide improvements and Pedestrian Improvement Areas and Key Pedestrian Locations are presented below. These suggested improvements are based on a pedestrian audit performed for each area, and on information provided by City staff, the public, and members of the BPAC. Further details about specific design criteria for these recommendations can be found in the San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines.

A) CITYWIDE IMPROVEMENTS

The following are improvements that should be considered and implemented throughout the City or within future city-wide planning projects.

A-1 ADA TRANSITION PLAN

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), which provides civil rights protections to persons with disabilities, was enacted on July 26, 1990. Title II of the ADA mandates that a public entity and the services, programs or activities that they provide are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities. The act requires any public entity that employs 50 or more people to prepare a self-evaluation to assess whether any of their programs and services are discriminatory, and to evaluate physical barriers to accessibility. As an outcome, public entities were required to develop a Transition Plan (by January 1992). The goals of the plan are to identify physical obstacles in the public entity’s facilities that limit the accessibility of its programs or activities to individuals with disabilities; describe in detail the methods that will be used to make the facilities accessible; specify the schedule for taking the steps necessary to achieve compliance; and indicate the official responsible for implementation of the plan.

The City of San Leandro developed an ADA Transition Plan in 1995 and updated that plan in 2010. As part of the update, the City performed a citywide survey of its existing facilities to identify barriers for accessibility.

An intersection in the Marina without curb ramps and tactile surfaces.

Additionally, the Transition Plan:

- Identifies existing facilities that limit access for persons with disabilities.
- Describes in detail the methods to be used to make facilities accessible.
- Specifies a schedule for improving facilities by prioritizing the needs of persons with disabilities in existing facilities.
- Indicates the official responsible for implementation of the plan.
- Develops a procedure for installation of accessible facilities.
- Monitors the Transition Plan via milestones.
- Provides an avenue for citizens to request curb ramps, Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS), and sidewalk repair.
- Coordinates with the San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
A-2 ASSESS AND REPAIR SIDEWALK SURFACE

Safe and accessible sidewalk connections are the backbone of creating a pedestrian-friendly city. The City of San Leandro has a very extensive sidewalk network. However, in order to build off of this existing network and promote connectivity and accessibility, the City needs to ensure that all sidewalk surfaces meet ADA standards. Meeting or exceeding ADA standards will contribute to a better pedestrian environment for all users.

ADA standards require a minimum of 4 feet of unobstructed sidewalk. Some exceptions may be made to a minimum of 3 feet because of right-of-way restrictions, natural barriers, or other existing conditions. If a sidewalk is less than 5 feet wide, a passing space, which measures 5 feet wide by 5 feet long, is required every 200 feet. Sidewalks should have a continuous surface that is not interrupted by steps or abrupt changes in level and have a slip resistant surface.

There are instances within the City of San Leandro where the sidewalks are not up to standard for a number of reasons. In many cases, sidewalks are old and their age has caused the surface to crack and cause abrupt level changes. Additionally, sidewalks are frequently obstructed by signs, poles, benches, or other streetscape amenities, which encroach on the minimum 4 foot sidewalk. There are also areas within the City where there may be gaps in the existing sidewalk network. As part of the ADA Transition Plan, the City should conduct an audit of the sidewalks and identify locations that need to be updated to meet the minimum ADA requirements. These areas should be prioritized by the City based upon their proximity to major destinations.

A-3 ENSURE THAT ALL CURB RAMPS MEET ADA STANDARDS

Curb ramps allow people with mobility impairments to gain access to the sidewalks and to pass through median islands in streets. Without curb ramps, these individuals would be forced to travel in streets and roadways, where they are in potential conflict with vehicles and/or are prevented from reaching their destination.

Curb ramps are required at every intersection where a pedestrian way crosses a curb. The preferred orientation is for two curb ramps per corner that align with the direction of the crosswalks. Sometimes the limited width of a sidewalk makes it necessary to locate one curb ramp in the center of the curb return. However, in locations where space is limited curb extensions should be considered as a method to widen the sidewalk and provide adequate room for curb ramps.
As part of the ADA Transition Plan, a survey of the intersections throughout the City was performed to evaluate the status of curb ramps based upon the ADA Accessibility Guidelines. Currently, the City requires all new development to meet ADA standards, and has an annual budget of $50,000 to bring existing ramps up to ADA standards; these are prioritized on a request basis or when roads are rehabilitated or improved by 25%.

In 2017, the City conducted a two-phase curb ramp assessment in two parts of the City. Phase one was in the downtown area and phase two was in the Manor neighborhood. The findings from these assessments will be used to guide the City’s aforementioned budget to make improvements in these areas and throughout the City. San Leandro should plan future assessment phases to study the remaining areas of the City.

A-4 UPDATE SIGNALS WITHIN CITY TO MEET ACCESSIBLE PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL GUIDELINES

Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS) are pedestrian activated signals that communicate information about pedestrian timing in a non-visual format and are spatially designed to be utilized by pedestrians with mobility and visual limitations. Accessible pedestrian signals help pedestrians with vision impairments to navigate an intersection by audibly indicating the WALK interval of the signal phase, and by guiding a pedestrian across the street with a constant audible destination message. The City has installed a number of accessible pedestrian signals at various locations throughout the City.

Currently, the CA MUTCD does not require accessible pedestrian signals at all signalized locations. They recommend that the installation of pedestrian accessible signals should be based upon an engineering study that takes into account potential demand, citizen’s requests for accessible pedestrian signals, traffic volumes, and the complexity of intersection geometry and traffic signal phasing. The CA MUTCD also recommends that local organizations, providing support services to pedestrians who have visual and/or hearing disabilities, can offer valuable input on the need for accessible pedestrian signals.

The San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines (2007) outline design guidelines for the use of accessible pedestrian signals. Currently, the majority of the signals within the City do not fully meet these accessibility guidelines. Standard City policy is that all new signals designed and built within the City will meet these guidelines. Retrofitting existing signals to meet accessible pedestrian signal guidelines will require significant construction and engineering in many locations. The location of new accessible pedestrian upgrades to existing signals is currently based upon citizen request with the services of an Orientation and Mobility Specialist to evaluate intersections and recommend improvements. To make the most use of available resources and to target the locations in most need of retrofit, the City should continue to
address citizen needs but should also work to create a prioritized list of signals for upgrades based upon the following criteria:

- Major intersections with medium to high volumes of traffic.
- Intersections with turning lanes, particularly if the signal pole and push button are located on a central median island.
- Intersections that are not at 90 degrees.
- Intersections that are located near schools, parks, youth and senior centers, shopping districts, and transit facilities.

A congested sidewalk with planter, street tree and utility box, constraining sidewalk width for pedestrians, raising ADA concerns.

A-5 ASSESS AND RELOCATE UTILITIES TO ENSURE ADA COMPLAINT SIDEWALK WIDTH

As was mentioned briefly in section A-2, there are some stretches of sidewalk within San Leandro that do not meet minimum ADA width requirements due to utilities, signs, or other street objects that are placed within this right-of-way. During adjacent development projects, street projects/resurfacing, or utility relocation, these sidewalk obstacles should be relocated if possible to ensure at least 4 feet of available space. Alternatives include: moving these objects as much to the side of the sidewalk as possible, undergrounding utilities, and widening the sidewalk.

A pedestrian signal head with countdown timer.
A-6 UPDATE THE PUSH BUTTONS ON PEDESTRIAN ACTIVATED SIGNALS

The type and location of the pedestrian signal push button are important aspects of a pedestrian signal that greatly influences their use and accessibility. Throughout the City of San Leandro there are a number of pedestrian signal push buttons that are not universally accessible. These push buttons are outdated and often contain small push buttons that demand a lot of force to activate. The City has begun to replace these outdated push buttons with modern push buttons that can be easily operated by persons with limited hand strength or dexterity, that require a limited amount of force to activate, and that respond to activation with a noise or vibration to alert the pedestrian that the button has been activated.

Updating the signal push buttons is one opportunity to improve the accessibility of pedestrian signals that can be accomplished with minor engineering and cost. The City should prioritize the updating of the push buttons in the short-term working with the BPAC and other community members to identify priority locations that need push button updates, and to ensure that all new signals include pedestrian activated push buttons that meet these criteria.

Additionally, some intersections may be candidates for automatic pedestrian phases. A growing best practice in certain high-volume pedestrian areas, such as downtown and near transit stops/stations (BART & East Bay BRT), is to provide pedestrians with an automatic pedestrian phase; meaning that the pedestrian signal does not need to be actuated with a push button. This signal phasing can improve the pedestrian experience in certain situations. The City should work with the BPAC to determine locations where implementing this phasing should be studied and potentially implemented.

A-7 IMPLEMENT, MAINTAIN AND ENFORCE PARKING RESTRICTIONS AT INTERSECTIONS AND CROSSWALKS

Vehicles parked in parking lanes adjacent to the curb return can limit the visibility of pedestrians at intersections and crosswalks. Implementing parking restrictions adjacent to intersections and crosswalks is a relatively easy method of improving pedestrian visibility.

Based upon MUTCD recommendations, the City should ensure that parking is restricted for a minimum of 1.5-car lengths (30 feet) on the nearside of a signalized intersection and for 1-car length (20 feet) on the far side of a signalized intersection. Similarly, a parking restriction of 1-car length (20 feet) should be installed adjacent to both sides of all marked crosswalks. Red "no parking zones" should be regularly maintained and enforced to improve compliance with these recommendations.

The City of San Leandro Municipal Code (6-1-500) states that it is unlawful for the driver of a vehicle to stop or park their vehicle within an intersection, in a crosswalk, on a sidewalk, or on any portion of the area extended from the edge of the curb (or from the highest point of a rolled curb) to the sidewalk. To create a culture of compliance for these existing and newly proposed rules, the City needs to consistently enforce these rules through warnings and ticketing.
A-8 IMPLEMENT STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS

Streetscape enhancements are pedestrian improvements beyond the minimum standard that help to create an enhanced pedestrian experience and contribute to the overall livability of the City. Streetscape enhancements include pedestrian-scaled lighting, street trees and landscaping, street furniture, colored or decorative paving, and decorative crosswalks. In addition, traffic calming measures are often employed to reduce crossing distances and traffic speeds and increase visibility of pedestrians crossing the street.

Streetscape enhancements should be prioritized for locations adjacent to major destinations identified in Figure 5 in Chapter 1. Streetscape enhancements should be of a similar palette to the improvements that have been recently installed in Downtown San Leandro and in the MacArthur Boulevard Pedestrian Improvement Area.

Curb extensions, street furniture, ladder crosswalks and street trees make this segment of MacArthur Boulevard more pleasant to walk along.

A-9 CROSSWALK IMPROVEMENT AND SCORING POLICY

The City of San Leandro (at time of print) was developing a crosswalk policy to aid City staff in tracking requests for new crosswalks/crossing improvements, scoring these potential crossings, and prioritizing these crosswalks for implementation. This policy, intended to change with new best practices and facility improvements, will be the guiding document that the City uses to determine how to improve pedestrian crossing facilities that are not a part of other capital improvement projects.

The Crosswalk Improvement and Scoring Policy can be found in Appendix E.
A-10 FREE RIGHT TURN LANES
Throughout San Leandro, there are multiple intersections that have free right lanes (also known as slip-lanes), some with pork chop islands. Free right turn lanes are dangerous for both pedestrians and bicyclists. These turn lanes allow cars to quickly make right turns, usually only yielding to other traffic. Free right turn lanes change intersection geometry, creating additional conflict points for pedestrians and making it harder to bring bike lanes all the way to intersections. The City should strive to remove free right turn lanes and rebuild those intersections to more safely serve pedestrians and bicyclists.

A free right turn lane at the intersection of Hesperian Boulevard and Lewelling Boulevard.

A-11 PEDESTRIAN ACCESS TO TRANSIT
Improving pedestrian access to transit should be a high priority for San Leandro. According to the latest American Community Survey data from 2015, over 12% of San Leandro commuters use public transportation; the second most popular mode behind driving alone. Bettering access to BART, AC Transit, LINKS, FLEX, and other transit services will be beneficial to San Leandro residents, workers, and visitors. The City should work towards ensuring that near BART stations and bus stops there are safe marked crosswalks. Depending on crossing conditions, some crosswalks may need to be enhanced to improve pedestrian safety and driver awareness and behavior.

In addition to crossings, transit corridors should also be improved with pedestrian-scale lighting, appropriate wayfinding signage, street furniture (bus shelters, benches, trash cans, etc.) street trees, and other features to improve the pedestrian experience. These changes will not only benefit transit users, but all pedestrians.

From Hesperian Boulevard, pedestrians access Bay Fair BART via Thornally Drive and a parking lot.
# Key Pedestrian Policy Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue to implement items from San Leandro's ADA Transition Plan</td>
<td>Increase accessibility and mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close sidewalk gaps</td>
<td>Increase accessibility and create a stronger pedestrian network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair uneven/broken sidewalks</td>
<td>Increase accessibility and make walking more inviting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue upgrading curb ramps to meet ADA standards</td>
<td>Increase accessibility and mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue updating push buttons on pedestrian actuated signals</td>
<td>Increase accessibility and improve the pedestrian experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to install Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS)</td>
<td>Increase accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess and relocate utilities and sidewalk furniture to ensure sufficient sidewalk width for pedestrians</td>
<td>Increase accessibility and improve the pedestrian experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforce parking restrictions at intersections and crosswalks</td>
<td>Make walking safer and increase pedestrian visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize San Leandro's Crosswalk Improvement Policy to prioritize enhancements</td>
<td>Make walking safer, increase pedestrian visibility, and calm traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove free right turn lanes where feasible</td>
<td>Make walking safer and calm traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to transit</td>
<td>Make walking safer, increase pedestrian visibility, and increase transit use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicit feedback and locations for improvement from members of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee and the public</td>
<td>Determine locations for improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B) PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENT AREAS

The following is a list of specific improvements that should be implemented within each of the Pedestrian Improvement Areas. These recommendations will need further analysis and design per accepted local, State and national standards and to ensure that they are feasible and appropriate. In addition, a detailed cost analysis will be needed as a next step towards implementing any of the following recommendations. Further detail about specific design criteria for these recommendations can be found in the San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines (2007).

B-1: SAN LEANDRO MARINA

A. Improve Monarch Bay Drive Sidewalks and Crosswalks: Continuous pedestrian pathways should be created on both sides of Monarch Bay Drive in the Marina, to facilitate a safe pedestrian environment to this major destination. Additionally, crosswalks, a minimum of 250 to 350 feet apart, should be installed along Monarch Bay Drive to encourage pedestrians to cross at safe locations. Further analysis of Monarch Bay Drive will need to be performed to determine potential crosswalk locations. To further improve the pedestrian environment of Monarch Bay Drive, traffic calming measures should be considered to slow down vehicle speeds. These improvements will be included in the redevelopment of the Shoreline area.

B. Create a Pedestrian Crossing at the Intersection of Monarch Bay Drive and Neptune Drive: This intersection is an important link between the Marina and adjacent neighborhood. The intersection has been designed with a median that prevents cars from turning left onto Neptune Drive from Monarch Bay Drive. Unfortunately, this median limits bicycle and pedestrian access to the neighborhood as well. This intersection should be redesigned to include a safe pedestrian crosswalk and bicycle entry. This project will be implemented as part of the shoreline redevelopment project.
C. **Improve the Sidewalks and Curb Ramps within the Residential Neighborhood:** The City should analyze the existing sidewalks to identify locations where the sidewalks and the curb ramps need to be replaced. Ideally the sidewalks would be a minimum of 5-feet in width and include an adjacent 3 to 4 foot landscaped buffer where width is available.

D. **Improve Neptune Drive Sidewalks:** Continuous pedestrian pathways should be created on both sides of Neptune Drive; currently there is a gap on the east side of Neptune Drive. This segment of Neptune Drive is an access point to Oyster Bay Park. Throughout this segment of Neptune Drive, there are multiple locations where street signs, streetlight/telephone poles, trees, and other objects obstruct the pedestrian pathway. These objects should be relocated or the sidewalk should be expanded around them.

E. **Improve Pedestrian Crossing at the Intersection of Williams Street and Neptune Drive:** This intersection is a key link between the Marina, the adjacent neighborhood, and Oyster Bay Park. A T-Intersection with two driveways at the top of the “T,” this intersection should be improved with marked crosswalks, curb ramps that aren’t shared with driveways, and the clearing of the obstruction on the northwest leg.

F. **Improve West Avenue 130th Pedestrian Facilities and Accessibility:** At both the intersections of West Avenue 130th and Neptune Drive and West Avenue 130th and Marina Court, there are no curb ramps present. Curb ramps should be added to improve the accessibility of these streets.

G. **Improve Pedestrian Facilities and Accessibility on Pescador Point Drive:** Sidewalks are missing on the east side of Pescador Point from Monarch Bay Drive to the McLure Boat Launch restrooms. This gap in the sidewalk should be filled to increase the safety of pedestrians and increase the accessibility of this part of the marina.

H. **Create a Mid-Block Pedestrian Crossing on Monarch Bay Drive near the Mallard Picnic Area:** The closest existing crossing to this area is at Fairway Drive, over 1,200 feet away. This area utilizes parallel parking on both sides of the street, and having a marked, designated crossing location can improve pedestrian access, safety, and visibility here.

I. **Improve Pedestrian Facilities and Crossings at the Intersection of Fairway and Doolittle:** This intersection is where two major streets cross each other, creating long crossing distances for pedestrians. This intersection should be improved by adding curb extensions. The corridors could also be improved by adding traffic calming devices to slow down vehicle speeds, further improving the pedestrian environment.
B-2: WESTGATE CENTER

A. Implement Safety and Circulation Improvements in the Westgate Center Parking Lot: The parking lot should be redesigned to provide dedicated pedestrian pathways to identify the pedestrian route of travel through the parking lots and minimize potential conflict with vehicles. New landscaping to provide shade should be incorporated into the pedestrian connection design. The pedestrian pathways that have been recently implemented at Bayfair Center should be used as a model for these recommendations.

B. Improve the Pedestrian Crossing at the Intersection of Timothy Drive and Davis Street: The recent Davis Street/I-880 Interchange Improvement Project, brought some pedestrian improvements to this intersection. The following are items that can further enhance it. There is an existing center median at this location that should be redesigned to provide a protected pedestrian refuge island for pedestrians. Additionally, curb extensions could help to shorten the wide pedestrian crossing. At the southeast corner of the intersection, there is a large turning radius from Timothy Drive onto Davis Street. A narrower turning radius has been painted on the street to channelize and slow the speed of right turns. This corner should be redesigned to replicate the painted turning radius, which would reduce the crossing distance across Timothy Street. These crossings should be high visibility crossings. Adding a crossing on the east approach should also be considered.

C. Improve the Pedestrian Crossing at the Intersection of Williams and Westgate Parkway: Williams Street is a critical corridor connecting Downtown San Leandro and other northern areas of the City to the Marina area and the Westgate Shopping Center. With a high volume of freight traffic in this area, enhanced pedestrian crossing facilities (such as high visibility crosswalks and freight-friendly curb extensions) should be installed to increase pedestrian visibility and safety.

B-3: KAISER DEVELOPMENT AREA/THE SPINE

A. Improve Sidewalks: As the area continues to be developed, the City should ensure that the development plans include wider sidewalks with a landscaped buffer to separate the sidewalk from the street, especially given that the area receives a sizeable amount of freight traffic.

B. Established in the Next Generation Workplace District Study, Merced Street is slated to become the "spine" of a new business center. The Spine will link the Westgate Center, Marina Square, Kaiser Medical Center, and any new developments in the area together. The Spine strives to create a cluster of restaurants, lodging, business, and personal services, after-work social venues, and office spaces.

C. Merced Street should be improved to increase pedestrian accessibility and make it a more inviting street for people to walk along. These improvements, include, but are not limited to: street trees, pedestrian-level lighting, enhanced crossings, and adding wayfinding/placemaking elements.
B-4: MANOR BOULEVARD

A. Replace the Rolled Curbs along Manor Boulevard: The rolled curbs along Manor Street should be replaced with traditional vertical curbs to inhibit the practice of parking on the sidewalk. When replacing the rolled curbs, the sidewalks should be widened to create more room for pedestrians and provide space for landscaping, if possible. Ideally, the sidewalks would be a minimum of 5-feet with a 3-to 4-foot landscaped buffer between the sidewalk and the street.

B. Create More Pedestrian Crosswalks on Manor Boulevard: In this residential neighborhood, crosswalks should be provided every 250-350 feet. Further analysis of Manor Boulevard will need to be performed to determine potential crosswalk locations.

C. Improve Pedestrian Facilities and Accessibility on Manor Boulevard: Gaps in the sidewalk along Manor Boulevard should be filled to create a strong network and improve accessibility. On the north side of Manor Boulevard, there is a gap in the sidewalk in front of Hope Lutheran Church.

D. Improve the Pedestrian Crossings at the Intersection of Farnsworth Street and Manor Boulevard: Located in the middle of the Manor Neighborhood, this intersection is in the middle of four-corners of retail uses in addition to multiple bus routes running along Farnsworth Street. To increase pedestrian visibility and safety at this intersection, three parking spaces should be removed from each approach to allow for curb extensions. Additionally, the crosswalks, currently marked as transverse crosswalks, should be upgraded to high visibility crosswalks (continental or ladder crosswalks).

E. Improve the Pedestrian Crossings at Manor Boulevard and Inverness Street: A stop-controlled T-Intersection with Inverness Street, the Manor crossing is currently marked with a high visibility ladder crosswalk. Due to this intersection's close proximity to the activity generators near the

The intersection of Manor Boulevard and Farnsworth Street.

The Manor Boulevard/Inverness Street crossing across Manor by the library.
Farnsworth/Manor intersection and the Washington Manor Branch of the San Leandro Library, it is recommended curb extensions be installed to further improve the safety of the Manor crossing. This crossing already has a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon. Additionally, the Inverness crossing should be marked.

**B-5: WASHINGTON AVENUE**

**A. Implement Pedestrian Streetscape Improvements along Washington Avenue:** Because of the roadway width along Washington Avenue, there is an opportunity to widen the sidewalks and provide a landscaped buffer along the sidewalk. New crosswalks should be implemented; further analysis of Washington Avenue will need to be performed to determine potential crosswalk locations. Curb extensions should be added at corners to reduce the width of the pedestrian crossing. Similarly, adequate roadway width exists to incorporate pedestrian refuge islands at major pedestrian crossings to improve pedestrian safety. Because Washington Avenue is a major arterial with multiple lanes and an I-880 interchange, pedestrian hybrid beacons (PHBs or HAWK beacon) should considered for installation at unsignalized crossings of Washington to both increase pedestrian safety and visibility, but also to increase driver compliance. Similar to East 14th Street, adequate roadway width exists to incorporate a landscaped median in the center of the street that would improve the aesthetics of the street and contribute to calming traffic. Landscaped medians should be extended to provide pedestrian refuges at intersections to improve the safety of the pedestrian environment.

**B. Create Safe Pedestrian Crosswalks at the Intersections of Washington Avenue and Halcyon Drive and Lewelling Boulevard:** The City should analyze the potential to remove the free right turns with pork-chop islands to improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.

**C. Create a Pedestrian Connection at the Washington Avenue Tunnel under the Railroad Tracks:** The City should work to gain an easement across the railroad tracks to establish an at-grade pedestrian crossing of the railroad tracks. The City should also work with Alameda County to further the development of the East Bay Greenway, which is proposed to run under the BART tracks from Oakland to Hayward. The East Bay Greenway would provide an at grade multimodal path above the tunnel, which would improve connectivity at this location.

**D. Improve the I-880 Overpass Pedestrian Facilities:** The pedestrian facilities should be improved to create a more comfortable pedestrian environment by adding a buffer between the sidewalk and the adjacent fast moving traffic. This should be coordinated with Caltrans the next time the overcrossing is reconstructed.
B-6: DOWNTOWN SAN LEANDRO BART STATION

A. Improve the Intersection of San Leandro Boulevard and Williams Street:
Just southwest of San Leandro BART, this is an important intersection as it provides a connection to Williams Street, a key east-west cross-town connector in San Leandro. However, this intersection is very wide and contains two free right turn lanes with pork-chop islands. The City should analyze the feasibility of removing the free right turn lanes and redesigning the intersection with curb extensions and pedestrian refuge islands to minimize the pedestrian crossing distance.

B. Improve the Sidewalks and Curb Ramps in the Residential Neighborhoods:
The sidewalks in the residential neighborhoods of this Pedestrian Improvement Area are old and should be repaired and replaced to ensure that they provide a smooth and accessible surface for pedestrians. The landscape strip should be made consistent and planted with street trees to provide a buffer from the street and improve the aesthetics of the pedestrian environment. Curb ramps in the neighborhood should be analyzed to identify locations that need upgrades.

C. Incorporate Streetscape Improvements and Public Space Additions into Future TOD Developments: As part of the City of San Leandro’s Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) strategy, the BART parking lot to the east of the station and the formerly vacant area to the west of the station has become the San Leandro Tech Campus. These developments provide affordable and market-rate housing and additional office space in the Downtown. These and other TOD projects will contain a mixture of residential housing, retail and office uses, and the design of the streetscape and open spaces associated with the projects will be critical to enlivening the surrounding neighborhood. New sidewalks should be extra wide to accommodate commuters, provide pedestrian amenities, such as benches, and provide space for outdoor retail or restaurant use. Ensuring direct and efficient connections to BART and nearby buses should be part of any future project and these connections should be retrofitted into existing projects if necessary to improve connectivity.

D. Safety and Accessibility Improvements at the Railroad Crossings: Within this Pedestrian Improvement Area, the railroad tracks cross both Davis Street and Williams Street. Railroad crossings pose potential safety and accessibility issues due to the following factors: inadequate warning and signage, crossings in poor condition leading to tripping hazards, large gaps in the crossing surface and flangeway causing bicycle tires and wheels to get stuck, and lack of education and understanding of railroad crossing operations. For both locations, detectable warning devices such as truncated domes, flashing signals, signs, and audible sounds should be installed to warn pedestrians of the potential crossing hazard and the potential for oncoming trains. The crossing surface adjacent to the railroad tracks needs to be maintained as a smooth and flat surface to prevent wheels and other
B-7: EAST 14TH STREET CORRIDOR

A. Consolidate and Redesign Driveway Ramps to Improve Safety and Accessibility: As the parcels along East 14th Street continue to be developed, the City should encourage new businesses to reduce the amount of on-site parking in front of the business and consolidate the number of driveway ramps to the street. In the interim, the City can assess East 14th Street to identify driveway ramps that are hazardous and should be redesigned, and ramps that are no longer in use and can be removed.

B. Improve Crosswalks at Unsignalized Intersections: There are a number of crosswalks located at unsignalized intersections that should be improved by restriping the crosswalks as high visibility crosswalks to increase their visibility. The street is wide enough to consider implementing curb extensions or pedestrian refuge islands at crosswalks to reduce the crossing distance and increase pedestrian safety.
New crosswalks at unsignalized intersections and crossings can improve the connectivity and safety of the pedestrian environment. Further analysis of East 14th Street and coordination with Caltrans will need to be performed to determine potential crosswalk locations. Many of the existing crosswalks are located at unsignalized intersections, and safety of pedestrians should be improved by restriping them as high visibility crosswalks or adding pedestrian hybrid signals, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), curb extensions and other improvements as determined by planning and engineering judgement. FHWA, NACTO, and AASHTO guidance can provide information on best practices. San Leandro’s Crosswalk Priority Policy can be used to help prioritize projects for study and implementation.

C. Reconfigure Median between Broadmoor Boulevard and Durant Avenue to Include Pedestrian Refuge: The median at the north end of the city is not well coordinated with crosswalks and does not help to improve pedestrian safety or connectivity. AC Transit East Bay BRT Project may modify and improve this crossing.

D. Implement the Streetscape Improvements Recommended in the East 14th Street South Area Development Strategy: The East 14th Street South Area Development Strategy identifies extensive recommendations for changes to East 14th Street in San Leandro south of Maud Avenue/Thornton Street, including lane reconfiguration, new crosswalk locations, design guidelines for new development, and streetscape improvements. The recommendations in the Strategy have been vetted by City staff and brought to the attention of Caltrans and should be pursued for implementation. Specifically, the Strategy calls for a new center median that will narrow the street, slow traffic and provide locations for pedestrian refuge islands. The Strategy also outlines locations for new crosswalks along East 14th Street that should be the basis for the installation of new crosswalks.

B-8: BANCROFT AVENUE/DUTTON AVENUE

A. Redesign the Dutton Avenue/Bancroft Avenue Intersection: This intersection would benefit from curb extensions and widened sidewalks at the intersection to improve the safety of pedestrians in this area and provide extended sidewalk areas for sidewalk seating and pedestrian amenities. The pedestrian amenities, such as tables, chairs and landscaping will contribute positively to the retail environment by creating outdoor space for people to gather and enjoy the neighborhood.

B. Create more crosswalks along Bancroft Avenue between Dutton Avenue and Callan Avenue: On Bancroft Avenue, the distance between crosswalks at Dutton Avenue and Callan Avenue is over 2,000 feet. This section of roadway should be studied to determine a potential location for one or more crosswalks to link the adjacent residential neighborhoods. Haas Avenue is one potential location that should be considered because of the existing bus stops at this intersection near the footbridge for the creek.
B-9: BAY FAIR BART STATION

A. Improve the Streetscape along Hesperian Boulevard: The sidewalks should be widened to provide space for a landscape buffer between the sidewalk and the street. Additionally, curb extensions or pedestrian refuge islands should be added to the crosswalks to reduce the crossing distance. Hesperian Avenue has a paved center median. The median could be planted with trees and landscaping to improve the aesthetics of the street and contribute to the reduction of vehicle speeds. Hesperian improvements should be coordinated with the recommended improvements from the Bay Fair TOD Plan.

B. Implement the Bay Fair BART Transit Oriented Development Plan: The City of San Leandro is currently developing a transit oriented development plan. The City should continue to work with BART and other partners to improve land uses and circulation in the area.

C. Hesperian Boulevard/Bayfair Drive, Hesperian Boulevard/Fairmont Drive Intersections, and Hesperian/Thornally Drive: Redesign of these intersections should include curb extensions and/or pedestrian refuge islands to reduce pedestrian crossing distances and improve pedestrian safety at these major, large intersections.

C. Improve the Intersection of Bancroft and Dowling Boulevard (currently in design): To improve pedestrian safety, the City should consider removing the striped pork chop island and free right turn lane. An ADA complaint curb ramp should also be installed at this location to improve the accessibility of the crossing. The radius of the curb can be tightened and other pedestrian and bicycle amenities can be considered to further improve the intersection.

D. Create More Crosswalks Along Dutton Avenue between MacArthur Boulevard and East 14th Street: This segment of Dutton runs through a primarily residential area; however, there are only seven crossings across Dutton between MacArthur and East 14th. With two elementary schools and some retail, improved pedestrian crossing facilities can both increase connectivity and improve safety. Of the existing crossings, both the Arbor Street and Kenilworth Avenue should be improved for pedestrian safety. Possible improvements for these crossings include Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons and curb extensions.
B-10: MACARTHUR BOULEVARD

A. Implement Traffic Calming at the Freeway On- and Off-ramps: Traffic calming and better signage at the on- and off-ramps of I-580 will help to reduce traffic speeds. Potential traffic calming measures include reducing the width of the travel lanes, speed feedback signs, or gateway elements. The City is currently considering implementing a roundabout at the intersection of MacArthur Boulevard, I-580, and Superior Avenue as part of Phase II MacArthur Boulevard Improvements.

B. Continue upgrading the sidewalks between Lewis Avenue and Estudillo Avenue: The sidewalks should be reviewed for uneven or failing concrete to ensure ADA accessibility. Additionally, there are a number of driveway ramps along the corridor that disrupt the continuity of the sidewalk. These segments should be retrofitted and the number of driveway crossings minimized as this area continues to develop. Curb ramps, crosswalks, and other pedestrian facility improvements should also be considered for this section of the corridor.

B-11: ESTUDILLO AVENUE/I-580 UNDERPASS TO CHABOT PARK

A. Create a Safe Pedestrian Connection from The City of San Leandro to Anthony Chabot Park: The northern shoulder of Estudillo Avenue should be widened to create room for a formal sidewalk, a minimum of 5-feet in width. The City of San Leandro will need to work with property owners along Estudillo Avenue, as the implementation will require the removal of parking on the shoulder and may encroach on adjacent parcels. This northern sidewalk may need to include a pedestrian crossing along Estudillo Avenue. Pedestrian improvements to the I-580 underpass should also be strongly considered to create a stronger, more inviting connection between the two sides of the highway.

B. Improve Wayfinding to the Entrance of Anthony Chabot Park: New wayfinding signage for pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists should be provided along Estudillo Avenue to guide users to the park.
B-12: HESPERIAN BOULEVARD

A. Bay Fair Transit Oriented Development Plan (currently in development) provides a plan for new land uses and circulation in the Bay Fair area of San Leandro. Part of this proposal includes a road diet for Hesperian Boulevard that would add a pedestrian and bicycle esplanade; providing greatly improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities along this critical corridor. Hesperian Boulevard provides key connections to Bay Fair BART and shopping areas at the Bayfair Center and in the southeast corner of San Leandro.
C) KEY PEDESTRIAN LOCATIONS

The following are descriptions of improvements that should be made at each of the 29 Key Pedestrian Locations. These recommendations will need further analysis and design per accepted local, state and national standards to ensure that they are feasible and appropriate. In addition, a detailed cost analysis will be needed as a next step towards implementing any of the following recommendations. Additionally, through a partnership with the Alameda County Transportation Commission’s Safe Routes to Schools Program, several San Leandro schools (both from San Leandro Unified and San Lorenzo Unified) have recently had school site assessments completed. Some of the recommendations for the schools listed below came from those recommendations. If a school underwent a recent school site assessment (not all schools listed below have), the full improvement plan can be found in Appendix G. Further detail about specific design criteria for these recommendations can be found in the San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines.

1. Garfield Elementary School: There is a yellow high-visibility crosswalk on Marina Boulevard, which should be repainted to maintain its visibility. School Warning signage should be placed in advance of the crosswalk and School Crosswalk Warning signs should be placed adjacent to the crosswalk to warn drivers of the potential of children crossing at this intersection. Curb extensions should be considered at this intersection (Marina Boulevard/Aurora Drive) to increase the visibility of students crossing at this location and decrease the crossing distance. The Shoreline EIR requires intersection improvements be made at this intersection, which can include the aforementioned treatments. A traffic signal is also planned to be installed at that intersection. Similar crossing improvements should also be considered at the intersections of Aurora Drive/Walnut Drive and Aurora Drive/West Avenue 130th. For the full improvement plan, please see Appendix G.

2. Davis Street/I-880: This interchange was recently rebuilt by Caltrans. During the rebuild, marked high visibility crosswalks and pedestrian signal heads were added. These are improvements over the previous interchange design, however, cars still speed through the interchange at high rates of speed, and there is no landscaped buffer to increase pedestrian comfort. While improvements will be limited on the elevated portion of the interchange, some pedestrian enhancements can be completed on both sides of the highway.

3. Cherry Grove Park: A new sidewalk should be added along the east side of Leonard Drive, on the north portion of the park, to connect to the existing crosswalk and parking area on the south side of the park. An in-pavement lighted crosswalk with pedestrian actuated flashing beacons should also be considered for installation at the intersection of Williams Street and Leonard Drive, near the entrance to the park.
4. **Woodrow Wilson Elementary School/John Muir Middle School**: The intersection of Williams Street and Joyce Avenue has a yellow high visibility crosswalk at the entrance to the middle school with pedestrian activated in-pavement flashing lights. There is a high visibility mid-block crossing on Williams Street between Campbell Avenue and Dolly Avenue. To further improve the pedestrian environment for these students and their families, additional crossings should be installed Williams Street/ Campbell Avenue and Williams Street/Sundberg Avenue/Leonard Drive; both with RRFBs.

5. **Wicks Boulevard at the Marina Community Center**: Two new high visibility crosswalks have been installed on Wicks Boulevard connecting the Community Center to Stenzel Park. These crosswalks still can be enhanced by adding curb extensions.

6. **Bonaire Park and Madison Elementary School**: The entrance to Bonaire Park is difficult to see because it is adjacent to a series of driveways for Madison Elementary School parking lot and residential housing. New crossings should be considered on Juniper Street at the intersections of Sagewood Avenue and Manzanita Avenue. Madison Elementary School is next door to Bonaire Park. The intersection of Juniper Street and Purdue Street and Juniper Street and Willow Avenue should be improved with high visibility crosswalks and curb extensions. See Appendix G for the full recommendations map.

7. **Pacific Community Recreation Complex**: Curb extensions should be considered for the intersection of Teagarden Street and Aladdin Avenue to reduce the crossing distance and improve pedestrian visibility. A new marked crosswalk and pedestrian actuated rectangular rapid flashing beacon should be considered for implementation at the intersection of Teagarden Drive and Montague Avenue.
8. Washington Elementary School: A yellow high visibility crosswalk has been installed in front of Washington Elementary School across Dutton Avenue with roadway mounted pedestrian signage, and pedestrian actuated flashing beacons with an in-pavement lighted crosswalk. This crosswalk also extends across a free right turn lane from Dowling Boulevard onto Dutton Avenue. The City should analyze the feasibility of removing the free right turn and squaring off the corner to improve the pedestrian safety at this location. Additionally, the crosswalks here should also be restriped as yellow high visibility crosswalks and school warning signage should be placed in advance of the crosswalk and School Crosswalk Warning signs should be placed adjacent to the crosswalk.

9. Corvallis Elementary School: At the intersection of Oberlin Avenue and Corvallis Street, there is a yellow striped crosswalk with roadway and sidewalk mounted pedestrian crossing signs. This crosswalk should be restriped as a yellow high visibility crosswalk. The intersection of Farnsworth Street and Corvallis Street has a free right turn lane with a pork-chop island. The City should analyze the feasibility of removing the free right turn and squaring off the corner to improve the pedestrian safety at this location. See Appendix X for the full recommendation plan.

10. Floresta Boulevard/Monterey Boulevard: The City should evaluate the free right turn lane with a pork-chop island to determine if it is feasible for removal. The city is also considering installing a traffic signal at this intersection.

11. San Leandro Boulevard/Washington Avenue Intersection: New Accessible Pedestrian Signals have been recently installed at this intersection to improve accessibility of the crossing. To further improve safety at this intersection, the City should analyze the feasibility of removing the free right turn lane and installing new curb extensions and pedestrian refuge islands.
12. McKinley Elementary School: A traffic signal with pedestrian activation is located at the intersection of East 14th Street and Estabrook Street in front of McKinley Elementary School. School Warning signage should be placed in advance of the crosswalk and School Crosswalk Warning signs should be placed adjacent to the crosswalk. At the intersection of East 14th Street and Blossom Way, a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon should be installed at the northwest crossing across East 14th. For the full recommendation plan, see Appendix G. The City recently installed a rectangular rapid flashing beacon (RRFB) at the Bancroft Avenue/Blossom Way intersection. To further improve safety to McKinley Elementary School (and San Leandro High), a yellow high visibility pedestrian crossing with School Warning signage in advance of the crosswalk and School Crosswalk Warning signs adjacent to the crosswalk should be implemented at the intersection of Bancroft Avenue and Warren Avenue.

13. Bancroft Middle School: During the school site assessment at Bancroft Middle, it was observed that a high volume of students wish to move from the northwest corner to the southwest corner of Bancroft Avenue and Estudillo Avenue. To better accommodate this movement, new signals and a pedestrian scramble, similar to the one installed at Bancroft Avenue and 136th Avenue near San Leandro High School should be considered for this intersection.

14. East 14th Street/San Leandro Boulevard Intersection: Pedestrian refuge islands should be installed in association with the existing central medians on East 14th Street. Curb extensions with compliant curb ramps should be implemented at all corners of the intersection dependent upon the available space. The City should analyze the feasibility of removing the free right turn lane onto San Leandro Boulevard from East 14th and replace it with a widened sidewalk and a standard corner treatment.

15. San Leandro High School and 136th Avenue/Bancroft Avenue: These locations are extremely important crossings because this is a key location for students traveling between the San Leandro High School main campus and the new Korematsu Campus. At 136th Avenue/Bancroft Avenue, the
City recently completed implementing a pedestrian scramble signal phase as part of a new traffic signal project. In front of the main campus, there is a heavily used mid-block crossing that students and staff use to access school buildings across Bancroft Avenue. That crossing should both be shifted to better align itself with the parking lot pathway that San Leandro High School students and staff use to access the other buildings and improved with additional facilities like a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon. Due to high pedestrian volume in this area sidewalks should be widened where possible. See Appendix G for the full SR2S recommendation plan.

16. Washington Avenue/Lewelling Boulevard Intersection and Lewelling Boulevard/Tropic Court: This intersection is very wide and contains two free right turn lanes with pork-chop islands. The City should analyze the feasibility of removing the free right turns and redesigning the intersection with curb extensions and pedestrian refuge islands to minimize pedestrian crossing distance. The intersection at Tropic Court has a high volume of collisions: four in the current reporting period. Crossing enhancements like curb extensions, leading pedestrian intervals, and high visibility crosswalks should be added to improve pedestrian safety and visibility.

17. Grand Avenue/Joaquin Avenue Intersection: A pedestrian refuge island has been added across Joaquin Avenue at the intersection of Grand Avenue. The crosswalks leading to/from the island are not marked; the intersection should be further improved with crosswalk striping.

18. Jefferson Elementary School: A new high visibility yellow crosswalk has been installed as a mid-block crossing on Bancroft Avenue. The crosswalk has roadway and sidewalk mounted pedestrian crossing signs. Pedestrian actuated rectangular rapid flashing beacons and curb extensions should be considered for additional safety and visibility at this location.
19. 150th Avenue/Hesperian Boulevard/Bancroft Avenue/East 14th Street Intersection: This wide intersection has not had recent pedestrian improvements. Curb extensions, curb ramp improvements, high visibility crosswalks, and pedestrian refuge islands will make this intersection safer and more accessible for pedestrians. The city is currently in the process of improving the traffic flow and safety as a part of the San Leandro Triangle Project. The city is also exploring the possibility of eliminating one leg of the triangle to create a wider, more comfortable pedestrian plaza.

20. Hesperian Boulevard/Lewelling Boulevard Intersection: Where space exists, the City should analyze if it is possible to remove free right turn lanes and widen the existing central medians to provide pedestrian refuge islands for pedestrians who are crossing this wide intersection.

21. San Leandro Boulevard/Park Street/Best Avenue Intersection: This intersection is located next to the very popular and recently rehabilitated Siempre Verde Park. At this intersection, no crossings are marked and only traffic from Best Avenue and Park Street are stop-controlled. Both crossing and traffic calming improvements are necessary at this intersection to improve pedestrian safety and visibility, especially, because of the increased presence of families and children enjoying Siempre Verde Park. Through a resurfacing project, the City is reconfiguring San Leandro Boulevard and this intersection to improve overall traffic safety.

22. Freeway Undercrossings for I-238, I-580, and I-880: San Leandro has three freeways that run through it: I-238 in the Bay Fair area, I-580 in the east, and I-880 running through the middle of the City. When the crossings are established with underpasses, the City should work with Caltrans to improve pedestrian facilities in these areas including sidewalks, lighting, and traffic calming; especially, if there are freeway ramps nearby.
23. **Merced Street/Wicks Boulevard**: This intersection is an asymmetrical T-intersection with two free right turn lanes. The free right turn lanes add additional conflict points for pedestrians, and encourage drivers to take turns at higher rates of speed. The removal of the free turn lanes and addition of curb extensions and other pedestrian enhancements will improve the safety and accessibility of this intersection. These improvements may also increase bicycle access.

24. **Alvarado Street/Fremont Avenue**: This is an asymmetrical T-intersection with a free right turn lane and two pork chop islands. This intersection currently does not provide a crossing for pedestrians to cross Alvarado Street. In addition to adding a crossing for Alvarado Street, the City should also study removing the free right turn lane, reducing conflict points for pedestrians and improving their safety.

25. **I-238/Hesperian Boulevard**: This underpass is a barrier for pedestrians as it is poorly illuminated and there is no separation for pedestrian (landscaped buffer) in this constrained portion of Hesperian. Although the street is constrained, this segment of Hesperian provides a critical pedestrian link to the shopping areas southwest of the highway. Hesperian Boulevard Improvements should be coordinated with the Bay Fair TOD Plan.

26. **Davis Street/Doolittle Drive**: This intersection is where two major arterials come together, creating wide crossings at all four approaches. Truck friendly (rolled) curb extensions, median refuge islands, and other improvements should be implemented to improve the safety and accessibility of this crossing.

27. **Railroad Crossings**: San Leandro has three sets of Union Pacific Railroad tracks: the Niles, Oakland, and Coast Subdivisions. The Oakland Subdivision parallels BART tracks for much its length in San Leandro (11 at-grade crossings). The Niles Subdivision is located west of that, north of Alvarado Street (8 at-grade crossings). The Coast Subdivision is located closer to the Bay, east of Doolittle Drive (5 at-grade crossings). The at-grade crossings related to these tracks create risks and conflicts for both pedestrians and bicyclists. The city should work with UPRR to ensure that crossing warning bells and crossing arms are functional and should install additional gates and protections where deemed necessary to improve pedestrian safety. San Leandro has already improved some crossings by adding pedestrian swing gates and additional signage; one example location at the Hesperian Boulevard crossing with the Niles Subdivision near the intersection with Springlake Drive.

28. **Dutton Avenue/Chetland Road**: This intersection is an important crossing location as it provides access to the back side of Roosevelt Elementary. Currently only the minor leg of this T-intersection is stop controlled. Only one crossing across Dutton is marked; it is a yellow ladder crosswalk. The
leg across Chetland is marked as a yellow transverse crossing. The existing old flashing beacon (for the Dutton crossing) should be upgraded to a newer beacon that is pedestrian actuated. Appropriate advance yield and stop markings should also be installed at this intersection. Curb extensions should also be considered for this location.

29. Bancroft Avenue/Oakes Boulevard: This is a slightly asymmetrical four-way intersection, where only the two minor legs on Oakes are stopped-controlled. Currently, no crosswalks are marked at this intersection. High visibility crosswalks should be marked across Bancroft Avenue. Crosswalks should also be considered for the minor approaches. Crossing enhancements like curb extensions or beacons should be considered for the Bancroft crossing(s).
One of the approaches of the Bancroft Avenue/Oakes Drive Intersection, looking eastward towards Oakes across Bancroft Avenue.
Safety, Education, & Enforcement

Chapter 5
Safety, Education, and Enforcement

This chapter discusses existing safety conditions for bicycling and walking in San Leandro, including an evaluation of recent collision activity and current safety and educational programs available to San Leandro residents. Additional education and enforcement programs are recommended to improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians and better educate all road users. It should be noted that while improving safety is extremely important and a high priority in San Leandro, riding a bicycle and walking, much like driving a motor vehicle, involves an inherent risk that no improvements can completely eliminate. It is the responsibility of all road users to follow the rules of the road, to treat each other with respect, and be diligent of other road users to increase road safety.

Collision Analysis

Pedestrian and bicycle-related collision data was obtained from the California Highway Patrol SWITRS database, for the years 2011 through 2015. This data was analyzed to identify patterns which might point to specific improvements needed in the San Leandro pedestrian and bicycle network. Figures 23 & 24 show this data spatially within the City of San Leandro.

In addition, current collision data was compared with available data from previous plans to determine if trends in the cause or location of pedestrian and bicycle collisions could help to identify the need for physical improvements or if the issues of most concern are educational and/or safety-related programs. The locations identified in the following section warrant further study. It is recommended that continued analysis of collision diagrams, on-site observations, and further monitoring of collision activity and enforcement be conducted. It is important to determine if collision causes can be traced to behavior or roadway design issues. Commonalities between incidents can aid in determining what improvements/programs would be effective in reducing collisions.

BICYCLE COLLISIONS

During the 5-year period of this analysis (from 2011 to 2015), there were 57 bicycle-involved reported collisions in San Leandro, down from 79 in the four-year period before the 2010 Plan Update. One of these 57 collisions did not involve any bicyclist injuries and one collision involved two bicyclists. One fatality occurred during this period. This collision occurred near the intersection of Marina Boulevard and Pacific Avenue. Additionally, one of these collisions also involved a pedestrian. This reflects an average of approximately 14 bicycle-involved collisions annually. This number indicates a continued drop from the average of 20 annual collisions in the 2010 Plan, the average of 23 annual collisions reported in the 2004 Plan, and the average of 32 annual collisions reported in the 1997 Plan. Wrong-way riding and right-of-way violations by
either the bicyclist or motorist continue to be the most common cause of motor vehicle-bicycle collisions.

50 of the 57 collisions occurred at or within close proximity (150 feet) of an intersection. The intersection of East 14th Street and 144th Avenue was reported as the intersection with the highest number (2) of bicycle collisions. Each of the remaining 55 collisions occurred at unique intersections.

The roadway with the greatest number of bicycle collisions along its length was East 14th Street in the 1997 Plan. The 2004 Plan reported Washington Avenue as the location with the greatest number of collisions. The current data (including collisions near its cross streets) again identifies East 14th Street as the roadway with the greatest number of bicycle-involved collisions (nine). Two streets had five reported bicycle-involved collisions: Doolittle Drive and Marina Boulevard. Lewelling Boulevard had four bicycle-involved collisions and Bancroft Avenue and Fairway Drive had three bicycle-involved collisions each. 144th Avenue, Lark Street, Fargo Avenue, Farnsworth Street, Hesperian Boulevard, San Leandro Boulevard, and Washington Avenue each had two collisions.

**BICYCLE FATALITY ANALYSIS**

During this data reporting period, there was one bicycle fatality that occurred near the intersection of Marina Avenue and Pacific Avenue. This collision occurred in 2013. The cause of the accident was determined to be an improper turning movement by the bicyclist. Bicycle facilities are not proposed for Marina Boulevard, but Marina should be studied for traffic calming improvements to make the boulevard more accessible for active transportation users, especially due to the close proximity to Marina Square and other attractions.

Figure 23 displays bicycle collision locations with injury severity throughout the City of San Leandro.
Figure 23: Bicycle Collisions Map (2011-2015)

SAN LEANDRO COLLISIONS

BICYCLE - INVOLVED (2011 - 2015)

- Fatality (1)
- Serious Injury (4)
- Minor Injury (46)

Map produced: May 2017
Data source: City of San Leandro, ESRI, TIMS, SWITRS
PEDESTRIAN COLLISIONS
During the 4-year period of this analysis (2012 to 2015), there were 92 reported collisions in San Leandro involving pedestrians with a total of 90 reported injuries. This represents a decrease in pedestrian-involved collisions (down from 109), but an increase in the number of injuries (up from 86). Five fatalities occurred during this period, a sharp increase from zero in the previous period. This data reflects an average of approximately 23 pedestrian-involved collisions annually. This number indicates a drop in the average number of collisions from 27 in the 2010 Plan and the average of 33 annual collisions reported in the 2004 Plan.

East 14th Street (and collisions near cross-street intersections) experienced the largest number of pedestrian-involved collisions for the 4-year period as was also reported in the 2004 Plan; the total current number of pedestrian-involved collisions is less (16 compared to 39 in 2010 and 45 in the 2004 Plan). Pedestrian-involved collisions along East 14th Street occurred throughout the corridor; but the two areas with the highest concentrations of these collisions were near downtown and Bay Fair Center. Davis Street, Hesperian Boulevard, Washington Avenue, and Lewelling Boulevard experienced the next highest pedestrian-involved collision rates with 14 collisions, 7 collisions, 7 collisions, and 6 collisions, respectively.

Unlike the 2010 Plan, less of the incidents (28 percent) occurred at intersections (down from 66 percent) as opposed to at intersection approaches or mid-block locations. Intersections with three or more collisions are:

- Lewelling Boulevard/Tropic Court (4)
- East 14th Street/Joaquin Avenue (3)

Intersections with two collisions during the 4-year analysis period are:

- I-880/Davis Street (3)
- Davis Street/Wayne Avenue
- Fairmont Drive/Bayfair Drive
- Fremont Avenue/Floresta Boulevard
- Hesperian Boulevard/Springlake Drive

Pedestrian-involved collisions and fatalities are displayed in Figure 24.

PEDESTRIAN FATALITY ANALYSIS
During this data reporting period, there were five pedestrian fatalities. These fatalities occurred at or near the following intersections:

- Approximately 145 feet north of MacArthur Boulevard and Estudillo Ave (2012)
  - The pedestrian was deemed to be at fault for not crossing at an intersection. The collision occurred about halfway between two

Hesperian Boulevard and Springlake Drive is a wide T-intersection.
Figure 24: Pedestrian Collisions Map (2011-2015)
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marked crossings; the two crossings are 260 feet apart.

- **San Leandro Boulevard and West Juana Avenue (2012)**
  - The driver was deemed to be at fault for an unsafe turning movement turning off of West Juana Avenue. The City recently has made pedestrian improvements at this intersection including curb extensions and new decorative crosswalks.

- **Approximately 15 feet north of Washington Avenue and Bradrick Drive (2014)**
  - The pedestrian was deemed to be at fault for not crossing at the crosswalk (likely from the gas station driveway).

- **Approximately 220 feet west of Manor Boulevard and Thoits Street (2015)**
  - The collision occurred directly across from St. Felicitas Church and Elementary School. The pedestrian was deemed to be at fault for entering traffic. The City should study whether an enhanced mid-block crossing could be installed, given the nearby church and private school.

- **Hesperian Boulevard and Thornally Drive (2015)**
  - The driver was deemed to be at fault for this collision for violating the pedestrian right-of-way. This location provides direct access to Bay Fair BART and the Bayfair Center. This location should be studied for crossing enhancements like curb extensions, leading pedestrian intervals, high visibility crosswalks, and road calming features. Hesperian is planned to have many of these improvements in the under development Bay Fair TOD plan.
Education & Encouragement Programs

In addition to improved design/engineering of intersections and their approaches, the safe interaction between people walking, bicycling, and driving hinges on a shared understanding of the basic rules and responsibilities for travel on public roads. Cities can play a lead role in promoting this understanding through educational programs and initiatives that encourage safe, responsible behavior by all road users. These programs can go beyond safety and include bike mechanics training, learn-to-ride lessons, and other types of programming. The following sections document existing bicycle and pedestrian education and safety programs currently in place in San Leandro. The subsequent sections also pose suggestions for increasing the robustness of existing programs, or implementing new, cost-effective programs with proven successes.

Existing Bicycle Programs

Programs to teach current and potential bicyclists of all ages and abilities about the fundamentals of bicycle road riding are an important educational tool; they help establish good riding skills and promote safe interactions between pedestrians, motorists, and other bicyclists.

San Leandro has secured a California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) Grant for conducting traffic safety education programs for youth (K-8 schools) and senior adults between October 2016 and September 2017. Traffic safety education programs were held throughout the year.

The following programs and initiatives are currently in place in San Leandro:

COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Beginning in 2003, the City contracted with firms to provide school workshops and traffic rodeos, community-based traffic rodeos and senior citizen traffic safety presentations for the continuation of the Pedestrian Safety Program.

- This program included 225 classroom workshops for elementary, middle and high school students, with each workshop geared toward a specific grade level. 25 school-based traffic safety rodeos were conducted for each grade level in the elementary schools during school hours. Community-based traffic safety rodeos were available to the general public and, as possible, were scheduled with other community events. Lastly, traffic safety workshops were held that targeted the senior community. These workshops were held at senior citizen centers and other community sites including housing facilities.

- In addition to the Safe Moves workshops and rodeos, many elementary schools hold yearly safety assemblies. Bancroft Middle School is unique in that it also has a BMX trick rider club that makes annual presentations to the physical education classes that include bicycle safety tips.
ALAMEDA COUNTY SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOLS PROGRAM
The Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC) currently operates the countywide Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S) Program. Participating schools are eligible to sign up for pedestrian and bicycle focused education and encouragement activities such as the Rock the Block Assembly, pedestrian and bicycle rodeos and visits from the BikeMobile. Additionally, participating schools can also have a School Site Assessment, where pick-up/drop-off conditions are observed, and both programmatic and infrastructure recommendations are provided to improve safety and efficiency at these schools. The City can work with ACTC and their partners to host additional site assessments at schools throughout the City.

BIKE EAST BAY WORKSHOPS
Bike East Bay holds periodic free cycling workshops throughout Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. Programs are designed to appeal to a variety of audiences and skill levels and include bicycle safety and traffic skills classes, family cycling workshops, children's bike rodeos, mechanical training, and learn-to-rides and more.

SAN LEANDRO BICYCLE MAP
The City provides a detailed bikeways and trails map that also includes safe bicycling tips, bicycling information specific to San Leandro, and city and regional contacts for additional information.

BIKE TO WORK DAY
Each Bike to Work Day (BTWD), the San Leandro Engineering and Transportation Department hosts a bicycle Energizer Station at the main entrance to the Downtown San Leandro BART Station. Food, drink and BTWD tote bags containing giveaways and outreach materials are provided. The San Leandro Energizer Station has experienced significant growth in participation over the years.
BIKE SAN LEANDRO
The first annual Bike San Leandro event, sponsored by the San Leandro Downtown Association, was held on May 2, 2010. This event promotes cycling in the city and includes a 5-mile family bicycle ride and a 13-mile more challenging mountain bike ride followed by a barbecue with live music.

Tactical Urbanism/Pop-Up Events
Tactical urbanism projects are temporary demonstration projects that are great opportunities to show communities new types of infrastructure and test the effectiveness of certain roadway treatments in a relatively inexpensive and temporary way. The City can explore these projects with local community partners and can coordinate them with other events such as Bike to School/Work Day.

Open Streets Events
Open streets events are activities where the segments of streets are shut down to automobile traffic for festivals or pedestrian and bicycle take-overs. These events typically occur for a few hours during a weekend day. The City can explore working with local community partners to host open streets events.

Recommended New Bicycle Programs
The City should continue to partner with community organizations like Bike East Bay on bicycle education and encouragement classes, media campaigns, training workshops and other education and encouragement activities. These activities should be targeted at all road users: people walking, biking, driving, and riding (buses, trains, etc.).

BICYCLE HELMET PROGRAM
The City should partner with existing statewide helmet programs to provide low-cost or free helmets to schoolchildren. In California, minors are required to wear a bicycle helmet while bicycling.

IN-CLASS BICYCLE EDUCATION PROGRAMS
Bicycle safety information could be added to the curricula of elementary, middle, and high school physical education classes, and might be implemented in conjunction with interested school staff, Safe Moves, the Bike East Bay, Cycles of Change, Alameda County Safe Routes to Schools, and other agencies/programs. Depending on availability of bicycles, staff interest, and liability considerations, off-campus bicycle rides might also be included as a part of physical education classes or as after school events.

ADULT BICYCLE EDUCATION PROGRAM
Expanding on existing Safe Moves and Bike East Bay workshops, an adult bicycle education program could be established through the San Leandro Adult School, Recreation and Human Services Department, or by contracting with the Bike East Bay or the League of American Bicyclists, which provides a variety of bicycle safety courses. This program would train adults to ride safely in traffic and provide instructions/tips for effective bicycle commuting.

TRAFFIC SCHOOL AND "DIVERSION" PROGRAMS
Bicycle safety should be an integral part of traffic school curricula for motorists; however, bicyclists hold an equal obligation to adhere to traffic rules. Accordingly, the City should consider instating a traffic school for cyclists. Such a program would parallel conventional motorist traffic schools and would allow bicyclists cited with a moving violation to take a class to lessen or eliminate their financial penalty. A similar, albeit less formal, program might also be required of youths who are stopped for illegal bicycling maneuvers. In
this "diversion" program, participants would attend a bicycling skills course, typically held on a weekend and conducted by the police department or other qualified agency.

**PARTNERSHIP WITH LOCAL BICYCLE SHOPS**

Bicycle shops are a natural community outlet for the distribution of bicycling safety pamphlets, maps, and other informational materials. Bicycle shops are also ideal locations to post notices about bicycle safety workshops and events. Additionally, bicycle shops may also offer knowledgeable personnel and/or sponsorship for future bicycling events and workshops.

**EARN-YOUR-BIKE PROGRAM**

Based on similar programs in neighboring cities, San Leandro might consider establishing an earn-your-bike program, in which youths participate in a certain number of safe bicycling skills and basic bicycle repair courses to receive a youth bicycling certification. The program could be operated by the San Leandro Recreation and Human Services Department, but might exist in partnership with Cycles of Change and local bicycle shops. If enough financial support is available, underprivileged youth might also be awarded bicycles for completion of this program.

**PUBLIC EDUCATION CAMPAIGNS**

These campaigns are designed to promote bicycling and walking by emphasizing the benefits of non-motorized modes.

- As funding or other opportunities become available, consider using volunteers or City staff to create public service announcements for display on television, the internet, and/or outdoor billboards.
- Partner with AC Transit to display posters promoting safe interactions between road users on transit vehicles and at bus stops.
- Partner with other cities to share and obtain traffic safety information and best practices. The City of San Jose's Street Smarts program (http://www.getstreetsmarts.org/) offers a well respected safety education module that is easily adaptable to other communities.
- Utilize home mailings and utility bills to distribute brochures, newsletters, and other safety and education materials. Consider providing different materials depending on the target audience, which might vary by location or age.
- Position signs at strategic locations advising bicyclists and motorists to share the roadway and that bikes may use the full lane (both of which have CA-MUTCD compliant signs).
Existing Pedestrian Programs
Pedestrian safety education targeted at all road users is an important means for promoting safe interactions between pedestrians, motorists, and cyclists. The following programs and initiatives are currently in place in San Leandro:

COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAMS
Community education programs relating to pedestrians and bicyclists are discussed in the Bicycle section on page 143.

NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC CALMING PROGRAM
The City of San Leandro has instituted a Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program for the use of engineering devices (such as speed humps, curb extensions, crossing enhancements, and others), traffic enforcement, and traffic safety education to reduce vehicle speeds and encourage motorists to use appropriate routes, rather than cut through residential areas. Local residential streets and residential collectors are eligible for the program. Inclusion of a street in the traffic calming program is initiated by a citizen and follows a defined set of criteria for improvement design, prioritization and public input. The City should actively promote this program.

The Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program includes a traffic safety education program with the following elements:
- Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program Handbook
- Neighborhood Pace Car Program where residents pledge to drive within the speed limit and abide by existing traffic laws. Participants are given decals to display on their cars to remind others to slow down.
- Safety brochures for adult and child bicycle safety, pedestrian safety, and motorist best practices

PEDESTRIAN SAFETY ASSESSMENT
In March 2010, the University of California Transportation Center (UCTC) completed a pedestrian safety assessment of San Leandro, which included interviews with city staff and a walking assessment of the city’s pedestrian network. The pedestrian safety assessment ranked the City’s treatment of pedestrian issues based on 35 criteria and provided recommendations for potential improvements. The UCTC team identified San Leandro as exceeding national best practices in 19 of the 35 criteria.

ALAMEDA COUNTY SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOLS PROGRAM
The Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC) currently operates the countywide Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S) Program. Participating schools are eligible to sign up for pedestrian and bicycle focused education and encouragement activities such as the Rock the Block Assembly.
pedestrian and bicycle rodeos and visits from the BikeMobile. Additionally, participating schools can also have a School Site Assessment, where pick-up/drop-off conditions are observed and both programmatic and infrastructure recommendations are provided to improve safety and efficiency at these schools. The City can work with ACTC and their partners to host additional site assessments at schools throughout the City.

**Recommended New Pedestrian Programs**

**WALKING AUDITS**

The City should consider holding periodic walking audits at locations with high volumes of pedestrian collisions and key pedestrian areas/locations. These events would bring together City transportation staff, police officers, bicycle and pedestrian advocates, and community members to plan ways of improving walking conditions and general safety at these locations.

**LOCAL WALKING PROMOTIONS**

Walk-your-child-to-school day, monthly community walking days, employer lunchtime walks, and organized walk-to-transit campaigns are all examples of simple initiatives that can simply and easily integrate walking into a variety of lifestyles.

**PEDESTRIAN MAP**

As a companion piece to the existing San Leandro Bicycle Map, the City should consider publishing a citywide pedestrian guide complete with safe walking tips, key pedestrian zones, annual or recurring events such as festivals and farmers markets, and contacts for additional walking information.

**PUBLIC EDUCATION CAMPAIGNS**

Education campaigns presented in the Bicycle section above, page 142, are also applicable to pedestrian safety initiatives.
Safe Routes to School

Safe Routes to School (SR2S) is a shorthand name for a broad array of programs designed to encourage walking and cycling to school. These programs focus on improving traffic safety around schools and promoting the health benefits of increased walking and biking. At the same time, SR2S programs benefit non-participating motorists and transit users with reductions in traffic congestion around schools. SR2S programs typically involve partnerships among municipalities, school districts, community volunteers, and law enforcement. Safe Routes to School programs encompass a six-pronged strategy known as the “Six E’s:"

**ENCOURAGEMENT**
Activities, such as Walk and Roll to School Days, provide incentives and support to help children and their parents try walking or bicycling instead of driving. Schools should also work towards organizing and implementing Walking School Buses and Bicycle Trains to support additional students walking and bicycling to school.

**EDUCATION**
Programming, such as the Rock the Block theater show assembly and bike rodeo, teach key messages about pedestrian and bicyclist safety, health, and the joys of active transportation. Classroom activities teach students how to navigate busy streets and make the connection between active transportation, health, and the environment. Education for parents/guardians could also be provided in partnership with district and local non-profits.

**ENGINEERING**
Tools such as school site assessments, help identify and address physical barriers. Safe Routes to School efforts can also help advocate for enhanced bicycle and pedestrian facilities near schools and can help coordinate tactical urbanism events that correspond with major events like Walk and Roll to School Day or Bike to School Day.

**ENFORCEMENT**
Reinforces legal and respectful walking, bicycling, and driving behaviors. Partnerships with law enforcement officials improve traffic safety around schools.

**EVALUATION**
Analysis can help schools measure their success at encouraging walking, bicycling, carpooling, and transit use.

**EQUITY**
A focus on equity works to support safe, active, and healthy opportunities for children and adults in low-income communities, communities of color, and beyond. These elements work to ensure that program resources are equitably spread around the County to reach the school communities that need them most.
San Leandro has applied for and received multiple SR2S grants, which have been used to fund programs, lighted crosswalks and other improvements. Additionally, the City has developed walking maps for all its elementary schools that indicate the suggested route that children should use to travel between home and school. If a school has had a recent site assessment, those can be found in Appendix G.

Schools in both the San Leandro and San Lorenzo Unified School Districts are active in the Countywide SR2S Program. The following San Leandro Unified and San Lorenzo Unified (within San Leandro city limits) were active during the 2016-2017 academic year:

- San Leandro High School
- Bancroft Middle School
- John Muir Middle School
- Washington Manor Middle School
- Garfield Elementary School
- James Madison Elementary School
- James Monroe Elementary School
- Jefferson Elementary School
- McKinley Elementary School
- Roosevelt Elementary School
- Washington Elementary School
- Wilson Elementary School
- Corvallis Elementary School (SLZUSD)
- Dayton Elementary School (SLZUSD)

The effectiveness of SR2S programs and projects in San Leandro could be enhanced if future SR2S grants and projects were coordinated to achieve a strategic vision. Thus, it is recommended that San Leandro develop a Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan with measurable goals and milestones. Guidance for this Strategic Plan could come from a Safe Routes to School Steering Committee, which could be composed of City and school district staff, parents, nonprofit organizations such as Cycles of Change, Bike East Bay, and other related stakeholders. This plan should also be coordinated with the larger countywide efforts of the Alameda County Transportation Commission.
Safe Routes to Transit

Safe Routes to Transit (SR2T), although similar in name, has a narrower focus than its sister Safe Routes to School program. SR2T provides funding for programs and infrastructure projects that facilitate walking and bicycling access to transit. SR2T was funded by Regional Measure II. SR2T funds can be used to help cities and transit agencies close the first-last gap, using active or shared (bike share) forms of transportation.

The City of San Leandro, in partnership with BART, has previously been awarded two competitive grants for pedestrian and bicycle station access improvement projects. These projects included the Bay Fair BART Station Area Improvement Plan (2007) and Downtown San Leandro BART Pedestrian and Bicycle Access Project (2009). As transit access improvement needs arise, the City should continue to pursue SR2T funds through partnerships with BART and transit operators such as AC Transit.

Currently, the City is in the middle of developing a Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Plan for the Bay Fair area. This plan will include active transportation improvements to increase the accessibility and safety of routes to and from Bay Fair BART, the shopping center, and any current/future developments.

The following pages display maps of the recommended bikeway network improvements, focused around San Leandro's two BART Stations.
Figure 25: Bay Fair BART Bikeway Recommendations
Figure 26: San Leandro BART Bikeway Recommendations

SAN LEANDRO RECOMMENDED BICYCLE NETWORK

RECOMMENDED BIKEWAYS
- Shared-use Path (Class I)
- Buffered Bike Lane (Class II)
- Bike Lane (Class II)
- Bike Route (Class III)
- Bike Boulevard (Class III)
- Separated Bikeway (Class IV)

RECOMMENDED STUDY
- Corridor Study

EXISTING BIKEWAYS
- Bike Lane (Class II)
- Buffered Bike Lane (Class III)

Map produced: January 2018
Data source: City of San Leandro, ESRI, Alameda County Open Data
Security

The San Francisco Bay Trail is currently patrolled by the East Bay Regional Park District Volunteer Trail Safety Patrol; however, additional enforcement on multi-use paths should be provided by the San Leandro Police Department. Existing vehicle statutes relating to bicycle operations and pedestrian violations will be enforced through the Police Department's normal operations.

In general, multi-use pathway bridges/undercrossings—such as the existing bridge over the San Leandro Creek—require special attention because they can be perceived as unsafe areas, particularly after dark. Any undercrossing or bridge without lights should be built/upgraded with lights, and all approaches to the undercrossing should provide the user a clear view all the way through/across the undercrossing.

The police department may have to be provided with special vehicles (such as trail bikes) for patrolling paths. It is estimated that one hour of additional police manpower is required for every 5 miles of pathway.
Enforcement

Protecting bicycle and pedestrian rights-of-way and enforcing traffic laws is an important component of bicycle and pedestrian safety; furthermore, proper enforcement fits cohesively into a management strategy that balances the needs of all road users. Traffic officers are responsible for traffic enforcement and collision investigation; however, no officers are specifically assigned to bicycle or pedestrian safety.

The San Leandro Police Department is responsible for patrols around schools, and enforcement is specifically targeted during pick-up and drop-off periods. The Police Department has two radar speed trailers that can be placed by request on a resident’s street or other locations for speeding abatement.

In the past, the City has conducted pedestrian sting operations, in which police target motorists who violate the right-of-way of pedestrians crossing the street—especially motorists who do not stop for pedestrians when cars in adjacent lanes have done so.

Potential Additional Enforcement Programs & Activities

NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC CALMING PROGRAM:

Continue this City-sponsored community-based program to define traffic calming needs and specific bicycling and walking issues in the neighborhoods. It is recommended that this program be expanded to include the bikeway network, particularly as applied to Class III bicycle routes and bicycle boulevards, and pedestrian improvement areas defined in the Plan as priority locations to be included in the Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program.

TRAFFIC OFFICER BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY TRAINING:

Traffic officers should receive training specifically focused on bicycle and pedestrian safety and enforcement principles. San Leandro should collaborate with surrounding jurisdictions and the Alameda County Sheriff’s Office and share resources as practical. If funding allows, San Leandro should consider appointing a bicycle and pedestrian traffic safety specialist.

ADDITIONAL STING OPERATIONS:

These operations could employ a decoy undercover officer who attempts to cross the street in the crosswalk. The City might find such stings to be even more effective by involving the media and distributing educational materials in addition to or in place of citations. Stings could also be applied to other road users, such as bicyclists, who might be stopped for wrong-way riding, failure to obey traffic controls, or lack of required safety equipment (helmets for minors or use of lights at night). As with motorists, bicyclist stings could be informational in nature or carry a fine with the option of utilizing a diversion program. In a partnership between law enforcement, bicycle and pedestrian advocacy groups, and local bicycle stores, informational materials given to offenders could also include coupons for discounts on helmets, lights, and other bicycle equipment.

ENHANCED POLICE ENFORCEMENT:

In areas of high pedestrian and bicycle traffic or high bicycle and pedestrian collision rates, the City should consider deploying a stronger police presence. As necessary, the Police Department may consider assigning more police to traffic control and issuing citations for traffic violations more frequently. Enhanced police enforcement should be used in conjunction with sting operations and walking audits to focus on improving the locations that are
the most dangerous for bicyclists and pedestrians. Before such a program is implemented, police officers need education and training on how best to approach an offender and what violations should be targeted for enforcement.

ADOPTION OF A BICYCLE TRAFFIC VIOLATION FINE STRUCTURE:
Since 1994, with the passage of AB 669, cities have had the discretion to reduce fines for infractions of the vehicle code incurred by bicyclists. It has been found in cities throughout California that a reduced fine structure has stimulated enforcement of bicycle violations.

BICYCLE DIVERSION TRAINING
Institute a Bicycle Traffic School ticket diversion program as allowed per California Vehicle Code Section 42005.3. Reducing or removing the cost of a bicycle traffic ticket via attendance at classroom workshop (or other offering) by local advocacy groups. These classes should be scheduled regularly with potential funding support from the City or Police Department. These classes should also be made available to both ticketed individuals and the general public.

OFFICE OF TRAFFIC SAFETY (OTS) GRANTS
OTS grants used for enforcement activities should target predefined, high collision locations and dangerous driving behaviors. OTS funding should not be used to increase ticketing of people biking or walking, but rather provide educational resources promoting safe and legal behaviors. The plan should not include a recommendation to implement bicycle stings, which have been shown to be ineffective and further discourage bicycling.
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Implementation

Implementation of the proposed bicycle and pedestrian programs described in the previous section will require funding from local, state, and federal sources and coordination with multiple agencies both within and outside the City. To facilitate implementation efforts, this section presents the project prioritization methodologies, summary of past expenditures, and conceptual cost estimates. At the conclusion of this section, funding and implementation strategies are described.

Project Prioritization

The proposed bikeway projects and pedestrian improvements, when fully implemented, will provide a comprehensive system for San Leandro. Recognizing that there are limited financial resources that can be devoted to these projects, it is necessary to establish a system for ranking or prioritizing the improvements that can provide the most effective use of available funds. The criteria used for setting priorities differ somewhat for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Both are described below along with the resulting list of projects sorted by priority.

BIKEWAY PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

Project Definition

The specific improvements needed to implement the bikeway enhancements will vary based upon the roadway characteristics, particularly roadway width and traffic volumes, speeds, and collision history to provide the most appropriate and effective facility for bicyclists and motorists. In general, these improvements include:

- **Class I Shared-Use Path (off-street)**
  - Paving and signage. Acquisition of right-of-way, fencing, lighting and amenities such as water fountains, benches, and restrooms may also be part of the Class I bike path installation.

- **Class II Bicycle Lanes/Buffered Bicycle Lanes**
  - Striping, signage and pavement markings where no other roadway modifications are needed.
  - Striping, signage and pavement markings where roadway restriping and/or lane narrowing is needed.
  - Striping, signage and pavement markings where removal of travel lane, parking or center two-way left-turn lane is needed.
  - Engineering study is recommended to determine what roadway modifications are necessary to implement bike lanes.

- **Class III Bicycle Route**
  - Signage only.
  - Signage and sharrows.
- Engineering study is recommended to determine what roadway modifications are necessary to implement a bike route and/or if bike lanes can be provided wherever possible.

- Class III Bicycle Boulevard
  - Striping, signage and pavement markings where no other roadway modifications are needed.
  - Striping, signage and pavement markings where roadway restriping and/or lane narrowing is needed.
  - Engineering study is recommended to determine what roadway modifications/road diet strategies are necessary to implement bike lanes wherever possible.

- Class IV Separated Bike Lane
  - Striping, barrier devices, signage and pavement markings where no other roadway modifications are needed.
  - Striping, barrier devices, signage and pavement markings where roadway restriping and/or lane narrowing is needed.
  - Striping, barrier devices, signage and pavement markings where removal of travel lane, parking or center two-way left-turn lane is needed.
  - Engineering study is recommended to determine what roadway modifications are necessary to implement bike lanes wherever possible.

The proposed projects are described by roadway segment, length, existing and proposed bikeway classification, conceptual cost, and total priority scoring in Table 17.
Table 17 - Recommended Bikeway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name (Cedar - Hemlock - Ottawa)</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alvarado Street</td>
<td>Fremont Avenue</td>
<td>Davis Street</td>
<td>II Buffered</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andover Street</td>
<td>Burkhart Avenue</td>
<td>Lewelling Boulevard</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora Drive</td>
<td>Polvorosa Avenue</td>
<td>Bermuda Avenue</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft Avenue*</td>
<td>142nd Avenue</td>
<td>200 ft S of Blossom Way</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayfront Drive</td>
<td>Bay Trail</td>
<td>Lewelling Boulevard</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda Avenue</td>
<td>Aurora Drive</td>
<td>Doolittle Drive</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkhart Avenue</td>
<td>Wicks Boulevard</td>
<td>Norton Street</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro Street</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Avenue</td>
<td>Merced Street</td>
<td>Corvallis Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corvallis Street</td>
<td>Ottawa Avenue</td>
<td>Farnsworth Street</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton Avenue (Dayton - Inverness - Fargo)</td>
<td>Farnsworth Street</td>
<td>Juniper Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Avenue</td>
<td>Grand Avenue</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doolittle Drive</td>
<td>Oakland City Limit</td>
<td>Farallon Drive</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay Greenway</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden Road</td>
<td>End of Road</td>
<td>Doolittle Drive</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmont Drive</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairway Drive</td>
<td>Monarch Bay Drive</td>
<td>Alvarado Street</td>
<td>II Buffered</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fargo Avenue</td>
<td>Farnsworth Street</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnsworth Street (1)</td>
<td>Vining Drive</td>
<td>Purdue Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnsworth Street (2)</td>
<td>Corvallis Street</td>
<td>Monterey Boulevard</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bike lanes are recommended for three segments: East 14th Street-146th Avenue, 142nd Avenue-138th Avenue, and 136th Avenue-200 ft. S of Blossom Way.
### Recommended Bikeways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Avenue - Evergreen Avenue - School Street - Wake Avenue - Halsey Avenue - Lark Street</td>
<td>Sybil Avenue</td>
<td>Fairmont Drive</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halcyon Drive (1)</td>
<td>BART Tracks</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halcyon Drive (2)</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>BART Tracks</td>
<td>II Buffered</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniper Street</td>
<td>Dayton Avenue</td>
<td>Cedar Avenue</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Chabot Road</td>
<td>Estudillo Avenue</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewelling Boulevard</td>
<td>Wicks Boulevard</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Boulevard</td>
<td>Superior Avenue</td>
<td>Fortuna Avenue</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Boulevard (Manor - Kesterson - Beatrice)</td>
<td>Wicks Boulevard</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Boulevard</td>
<td>Neptune Drive</td>
<td>Doolittle Drive</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced Street/Wicks Boulevard</td>
<td>Fairway Drive</td>
<td>Burroughs Avenue</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monarch Bay Drive</td>
<td>Flood Control Cannel</td>
<td>Neptune Drive</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Boulevard</td>
<td>Alvarado Street</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton Street</td>
<td>Washington Manor Park</td>
<td>Burkhart Avenue</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakes Boulevard (Oakes - Maple - Dowling - Superior)</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>MacArthur Boulevard</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyster Bay Regional Park</td>
<td>Existing Trail</td>
<td>Existing Trail</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peralta Avenue</td>
<td>San Leandro Boulevard</td>
<td>End of cul-de-sac</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue Street</td>
<td>Crosby Street</td>
<td>Juniper Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro Boulevard</td>
<td>Creekside Plaza</td>
<td>Park Street</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro Creek</td>
<td>UPRR Niles Subdivision</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommended Bikeways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo Creek</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>Farnsworth Street (extension)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springlake Drive</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>II Buffered</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sybil Avenue</td>
<td>Grand Avenue</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teagarden Street</td>
<td>Fairway Drive</td>
<td>Marina Boulevard</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Drive</td>
<td>Williams Street</td>
<td>Davis Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Broadmoor Boulevard</td>
<td>San Leandro Boulevard</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Avenue (1)</td>
<td>Lloyd Avenue</td>
<td>San Lorenzo Creek</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Avenue (2)</td>
<td>Caliente Drive</td>
<td>143rd Avenue</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Avenue</td>
<td>Marina Boulevard</td>
<td>Davis Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicks Boulevard</td>
<td>Burroughs Avenue</td>
<td>Lewelling Boulevard</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Street</td>
<td>San Leandro Boulevard</td>
<td>Neptune Drive</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRIORITIZATION METHODOLOGY
The methodology used to prioritize projects was updated from the previous plan based upon input from City staff, the BPAC and current best practices and existing conditions. Each bikeway project was evaluated with a total of 27 possible points based upon the five categories discussed below. The bikeway project prioritization sheet is included in Appendix B.

- **Connection to Activity Centers** (total of 6 points) – Projects which provide access to local and regional activity centers such as schools, major employment centers or Downtown, major shopping centers, libraries and parks or recreational facilities. Because of the City's focus on school safety, an extra point was given to projects that provide/enhance access to schools.

- **Safety** (total of 4 points) – Projects which address a safety concern such as high number of collisions or riding along a busy (high volume/speed) arterial street. Because of the City's focus on safety, this category was weighted to provide additional points for projects that meet these safety criteria.

- **Connectivity** (total of 7 points) – Projects which improve connectivity for bicyclists by eliminating an existing barrier or hazard, bridging a gap in an existing bikeway, connecting to an existing or proposed facility, located on, or connects to, a bikeway in an adjacent jurisdiction or to the regional or county network, or provides a connection through the city.

- **Transit Access** (total of 3 points) – Projects which connect to a BART station, high capacity bus line, future BRT service or local bus route.

- **Funding & Implementation** (total of 7 points) – Projects which do not require significant additional planning or study or extensive modifications to implement; projects which are part of a recognized current or future project or can be implemented without coordination with agencies outside the City; projects that would be competitive for alternative funding sources; and projects that have community support.

The projects were grouped into three implementation categories based upon the resultant project scoring. The three categories are defined as follows:

- **Phase I (Short-Term Projects)**: Projects that received the highest relative scores. These projects have the highest priority for implementation and are targeted for completion within five years.

- **Phase II (Medium-Term Projects)**: Projects that received moderate relative scores. These projects are included in the second group of projects considered for implementation and are targeted for completion within 10 years.

- **Phase III (Long-Term Projects)**: Projects that received the lowest relative scores and the lowest priority for implementation. Although the projects in this group scored low, they are part of a plan that, when fully developed, forms a comprehensive bikeway system. These projects are targeted for completion within 10-20 years.

The prioritized projects, listed from High to Low, are shown in Table 18.
### Table 18 - Prioritized Recommended Bikeway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Activity Centers</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Transit Access</th>
<th>Funding &amp; Implementation</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Williams Street</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay Greenway</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnsworth Street (1)</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doolittle Drive</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairway Drive</td>
<td>II Buffered</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewelling Boulevard</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft Avenue</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvarado Street</td>
<td>II Buffered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora Drive</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fargo Avenue</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakes Boulevard</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Avenue (1)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halcyon Drive (1)</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Boulevard</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monarch Bay Drive</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmont Drive</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnsworth Street (2)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Boulevard</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Avenue - Evergreen Avenue - School Street - Wake Avenue - Halsey Avenue - Lark Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo Creek</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced Street/Wicks Boulevard</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Prioritized Bikeway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Activity Centers</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Transit Access</th>
<th>Funding &amp; Implementation</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purdue Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro Boulevard</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teagarden Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Avenue</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andover Street</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corvallis Street</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halcyon Drive (2)</td>
<td>II Buffered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sybil Avenue</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Avenue</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyster Bay Regional Park</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniper Street</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton Street</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peralta Avenue</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Drive</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicks Boulevard</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkhart Avenue</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Boulevard</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro Creek</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springlake Drive</td>
<td>II Buffered</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden Road</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayfront Drive</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Avenue</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton Avenue</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Prioritized Bikeway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Activity Centers</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Transit Access</th>
<th>Funding &amp; Implementation</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Boulevard</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Broadmoor Boulevard</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Avenue (2)</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Chabot Road</td>
<td>III Blvd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda Avenue</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PEDESTRIAN PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

Project Definition
The recommended pedestrian projects are organized based upon the Pedestrian Improvement Area or Key Pedestrian Location within which they are located. The proposed projects are summarized in Table 19 below. The table outlines important information for future implementation, including a range of construction cost estimates and priority scoring.

PROJECT METHODOLOGY
This methodology was tailored specifically to address pedestrian network issues, and was revised based upon input from City staff and the BPAC. Each of the pedestrian projects was evaluated based upon the five categories listed below using the Pedestrian Prioritization Sheet which is included in Appendix B. Each project could receive up to a total of 24 points.

- **Accessibility** (Total of 3 points) - This category ranks how accessibility would be improved by the project. Points are awarded for improvements that create accessibility in previously inaccessible areas, remedy city-wide barriers to pedestrian connectivity, and that go above and beyond the minimum requirements.

- **Safety** (Total of 5 Points) - This category ranks how pedestrian safety would be improved by the project. Points are awarded to projects that are located adjacent to schools, within an area with a high pedestrian collision rate, and include design features to increase pedestrian safety. Because of the City’s focus on safety, this category was weighted to provide additional points for projects that meet these safety criteria.

- **Connectivity** (Total of 7 points) - This category ranks how the project would improve connectivity. Points are awarded to projects that are located near schools, major employment centers, major shopping centers, libraries, parks and recreation facilities, and major transit routes. Because of the City’s focus on school safety, an extra point was given to projects that provide/enhance access to schools.

- **Walkability** (Total of 2 Points) - This category ranks how pedestrian safety would be improved by the project. Points are awarded to projects that are located adjacent to schools, within an area with a high pedestrian collision rate, and include design features to increase pedestrian safety. Because of the City’s focus on safety, this category was weighted to provide additional points for projects that meet these safety criteria.

- **Funding & Implementation** (Total of 7 points) - This category ranks projects based upon their potential to acquire funding and to be easily implemented. Points were awarded to projects that could be implemented without further study, would not require coordination with agencies outside the city, or would not require extensive modifications for implementation. Point were also awarded if the project was supported in other plans or projects, had extensive community support, and was eligible for outside funding sources.
## Table 19: Recommended Pedestrian Projects with Conceptual Costs and Priority Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ped ID</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>Priority Points</th>
<th>Cost Estimates*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-1 A</td>
<td>Monarch Bay Drive Sidewalks &amp; Crosswalks</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1 B</td>
<td>Monarch Bay Drive and Neptune Drive Crossing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1 C</td>
<td>Sidewalks and Curb Ramps in the Marina Shoreline Area</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1 D</td>
<td>Neptune Drive Crosswalks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1 E</td>
<td>Williams Street and Neptune Drive Crossing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1 F</td>
<td>West Avenue 130th Ped Facilities and Accessibility</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1 G</td>
<td>Pescador Point Drive Ped Facilities and Accessibility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1 H</td>
<td>Monarch Bay Drive Mid-block Crossing near Mallard Picnic Area</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1 I</td>
<td>Pedestrian Facilities and Crossings at the Intersection of Fairway Drive and Doolittle Drive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2 A</td>
<td>Parking Lot Safety and Circulation Improvements</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2 B</td>
<td>Pedestrian Crossing at Timothy Drive and Davis Street</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2 C</td>
<td>Pedestrian Crossing at Williams Street and Westgate Parkway</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3 A</td>
<td>Improve sidewalks in Kaiser Medical Center area</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4 A</td>
<td>Replace Rolled Curbs along Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4 B</td>
<td>More Crosswalks on Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4 C</td>
<td>Improve Pedestrian Facilities and Accessibility on Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4 D</td>
<td>Improve Pedestrian Crossings at Farnsworth Street and Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4 E</td>
<td>Improve Pedestrian Crossings at Manor Boulevard and Inverness Street</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5 F</td>
<td>Washington Avenue Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5 G</td>
<td>Washington Avenue/Halcyon Drive &amp; Lewelling Boulevard crosswalks</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5 H</td>
<td>Washington Avenue Tunnel Pedestrian Connection</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Low Cost ($0-39,999); Medium Cost ($40,000-99,999); High Cost ($100,000 and up)
### Recommended Pedestrian Improvements: Priority Areas and Key Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ped ID</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>Priority Points</th>
<th>Conceptual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-5 I</td>
<td>Improve I-880 Overpass Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6 A</td>
<td>Improve the Intersection of San Leandro Boulevard and Williams Street</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6 B</td>
<td>Improve the Sidewalks and Curb Ramps in Residential Neighborhoods</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6 C</td>
<td>Incorporate Streetscape Improvements and Public Space into Future TOD Developments</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6 D</td>
<td>Safety and Accessibility Improvements at Railroad Crossings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7: East 14th Street Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7 A</td>
<td>Consolidate and Redesign Driveway Ramps to Improve Safety and Accessibility</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7 B</td>
<td>Improve Crosswalks at Signalized Intersections along East 14th Street</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7 C</td>
<td>Reconfigure Median between Broadmoor Boulevard and Durant Avenue to Include Pedestrian Refuge</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7 D</td>
<td>Implement the Streetscape Improvements Recommended in the East 14th Street South Area Development Strategy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8: Bancroft Avenue/Dutton Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-8 A</td>
<td>Redesign the Dutton Avenue/Bancroft Avenue Intersection</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-8 B</td>
<td>Create More Crosswalks Along Bancroft Avenue between Dutton Ave and Callan Avenue</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-8 C</td>
<td>Improve the Intersection of Bancroft and Dowling Boulevard (currently in design)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-8 D</td>
<td>Create more crosswalks along Dutton Avenue between MacArthur Boulevard and East 14th Street</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9: Bay Fair BART Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-9 A</td>
<td>Improve Streetscape along the Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-9 B</td>
<td>Implement Bay Fair BART TOD Plan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-9 C</td>
<td>Redesign Hesperian Boulevard/Bayfair Drive, Hesperian Boulevard/Fairmont Drive, and Hesperian Boulevard/Thornally Drive intersections</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10: MacArthur Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-10 A</td>
<td>Implement Traffic Calming at the Freeway On-and-Off Ramps</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-10 B</td>
<td>Continue Upgrading the Sidewalks Between Lewis Avenue and Estudillo Avenue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Low Cost ($0-39,999); Medium Cost ($40,000-99,999); High Cost ($100,000 and up)*
## Recommended Pedestrian Improvements: Priority Areas and Key Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ped ID</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>Priority Points</th>
<th>Conceptual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B11 A</td>
<td>Create Safe Pedestrian Connection from San Leandro to Chabot Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11 B</td>
<td>Improve Wayfinding to Anthony Chabot Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B12: Hesperian Boulevard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ped ID</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>Priority Points</th>
<th>Conceptual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-12 A</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Pedestrian Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ped ID</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>Priority Points</th>
<th>Conceptual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Garfield Elementary School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Davis Street/I-880</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Cherry Grove Park</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Woodrow Wilson Elementary School/John Muir Middle School</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Marina Community Center</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>Bonaire Park</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>Pacific Community Recreation Complex</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>Washington Elementary School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>Corvallis Elementary School</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>Floresta Boulevard/ Monterey Boulevard/Monroe Elementary School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>San Leandro Boulevard/Washington Avenue</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>McKinley Elementary School</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>Bancroft Middle School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>East 14th Street/San Leandro Boulevard</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>136th Avenue/Bancroft Avenue</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>Washington Avenue/Lewelling Boulevard &amp; Lewelling Boulevard/Tropic Court</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>Grand Avenue/Joaquin Avenue</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Jefferson Elementary School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19</td>
<td>150th Avenue/Hesperian Boulevard/Bancroft Avenue/East 14th Street</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Low Cost ($0-39,999); Medium Cost ($40,000-99,999); High Cost ($100,000 and up)
### Recommended Pedestrian Improvements: Priority Areas and Key Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ped ID</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>Priority Points</th>
<th>Conceptual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C20</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard/Lewelling Boulevard</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21</td>
<td>San Leandro Boulevard/Park Street/Best Avenue</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22</td>
<td>Freeway Undercrossings for I-580/I-880/I-238</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23</td>
<td>Merced Street/Wicks Boulevard</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C24</td>
<td>Alvarado Street/Fremont Avenue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C25</td>
<td>I-238/Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C26</td>
<td>Davis Street/Doolittle Drive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C27</td>
<td>Railroad Crossings (UPRR Niles, Oakland, and Coast Subdivisions)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C28</td>
<td>Dutton Avenue/Chetland Road</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C29</td>
<td>Bancroft Avenue/Oakes Boulevard</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Low Cost ($0-39,999); Medium Cost ($40,000-99,999); High Cost ($100,000 and up)*
The projects were grouped into three implementation categories based upon the resultant project scoring. The three categories are defined as follows:

**Phase I (Short-Term Projects):** Projects that received the highest relative scores. These projects have the highest priority for implementation and are targeted for completion within five years.

**Phase II (Medium-Term Projects):** Projects that received moderate relative scores. These projects are included in the second group of projects considered for implementation and are targeted for completion within 10 years.

**Phase III (Long-Term Projects):** Projects that received the lowest relative scores and the lowest priority for implementation. These projects are targeted for completion within 10-20 years.

The prioritized projects, listed from High to Low, are shown in Table 20 below.
### Table 20 - Prioritized Recommended Pedestrian Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PedID</th>
<th>Description/Location</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Walkability</th>
<th>Funding &amp; Implementation</th>
<th>Priority Points</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-7 D</td>
<td>Implement the Streetscape Improvements Recommended in the East 14th Street South Area Development Strategy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7 B</td>
<td>Improve Crosswalks at Unsignalized Intersections along East 14th Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Woodrow Wilson Elementary School/John Muir Middle School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>East 14th Street/ San Leandro Boulevard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>Washington Avenue/Lewelling Boulevard &amp; Lewelling Boulevard/Tropic Court</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C29</td>
<td>Bancroft Avenue/Oakes Boulevard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>Corvallis Elementary School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>McKinley Elementary School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C27</td>
<td>Railroad Crossings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4 B</td>
<td>More Crosswalks on Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5 A</td>
<td>Washington Avenue Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5 B</td>
<td>Washington Avenue/Halcyon Drive &amp; Lewelling Boulevard crosswalks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4 C</td>
<td>Improve Pedestrian Facilities and Accessibility on Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4 D</td>
<td>Improve Pedestrian Crossings at Farnsworth Street and Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>Pacific Community Recreation Complex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>Washington Elementary School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>Floresta Boulevard/Monterey Boulevard/Monroe Elementary School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommended Pedestrian Project Prioritization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PedID</th>
<th>Description/Location</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Walkability</th>
<th>Funding &amp; Implementation</th>
<th>Priority Points</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>Bancroft Middle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>136th Ave/ Bancroft Ave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1 C</td>
<td>Sidewalks and Curb Ramps in the Marina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-12 A</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Garfield Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Cherry Grove Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>Bonaire Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Jefferson Elementary School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C28</td>
<td>Dutton Avenue/Chetland Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1 B</td>
<td>Monarch Bay Drive and Neptune Drive Crossing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4 A</td>
<td>Replace Rolled Curbs along Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-8 B</td>
<td>Create More Crosswalks Along Bancroft Avenue between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dutton Avenue and Callan Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-9 A</td>
<td>Improve Streetscape along the Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-9 B</td>
<td>Implement Bay Fair BART TOD Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-9 C</td>
<td>Redesign Hesperian Boulevard/Bayfair Drive, Hesperian/</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairmont Drive, Hesperian/Thornally Drive intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7 A</td>
<td>Consolidate Driveways to Improve Safety &amp; Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-8 A</td>
<td>Redesign Dutton Avenue/Bancroft Avenue Intersection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-8 D</td>
<td>Create more crosswalks along Dutton Avenue between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MacArthur Boulevard and East 14th Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>Grand Avenue/Joaquin Avenue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19</td>
<td>150th Avenue/Hesperian/Bancroft/ East 14th Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22</td>
<td>Freeway Undercrossings for I-580/I-880/I-238</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7 C</td>
<td>Improve the Intersection of Bancroft and Dowling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recommended Pedestrian Project Prioritization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PedID</th>
<th>Description/Location</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Walkability</th>
<th>Funding &amp; Implementation</th>
<th>Priority Points</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C21</td>
<td>San Leandro Boulevard/Park Street/Best Avenue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2 C</td>
<td>Crossings at Williams Street and Westgate Parkway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5 D</td>
<td>Safety and Accessibility Improvements at RR Crossings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Davis Street/I-880</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Marina Community Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C20</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard/Lewelling Boulevard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1 A</td>
<td>Monarch Bay Drive Sidewalks &amp; Crosswalks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1 E</td>
<td>Williams Street and Neptune Drive Crossing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1 F</td>
<td>West Avenue 130th Ped Facilities and Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2 B</td>
<td>Pedestrian Crossing at Timothy Drive and Davis Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1 I</td>
<td>Pedestrian Facilities and Crossings at the Intersection of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairway Drive and Doolittle Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4 E</td>
<td>Improve Pedestrian Crossings at Manor and Inverness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6 C</td>
<td>Incorporate Streetscape Improvements and Public Space into</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future TOD Developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-10 B</td>
<td>Continue Upgrading the Sidewalks Between Lewis Avenue and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estudillo Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-11 A</td>
<td>Create Safe Pedestrian Connection from San Leandro to Chabot</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-11 B</td>
<td>Improve Wayfinding to Anthony Chabot Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1 H</td>
<td>Monarch Bay Drive Mid-block Crossing near Mallard Picnic Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5 A</td>
<td>Washington Avenue Tunnel Pedestrian Connection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PedID</td>
<td>Description/Location</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>Walkability</td>
<td>Funding &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>Priority Points</td>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6 A</td>
<td>Improve the intersection of San Leandro Boulevard and Williams Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6 B</td>
<td>Improve the Sidewalks and Curb Ramps in Residential Neighborhoods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>San Leandro Boulevard/Washington Avenue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C26</td>
<td>Davis Street/Doolittle Drive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3 A</td>
<td>Improve sidewalks in Kaiser Medical Center area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7 C</td>
<td>Reconfigure Median between Broadmoor Boulevard and Durant Avenue to Include Pedestrian Refuge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-10 A</td>
<td>Implement Traffic Calming at the Freeway On-and-Off Ramps</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23</td>
<td>Merced Street/Wicks Boulevard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C24</td>
<td>Alvarado Street/Fremont Avenue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C25</td>
<td>I-238/Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1 G</td>
<td>Pescador Point Drive Ped Facilities and Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2 A</td>
<td>Parking Lot Safety and Circulation Improvements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1 D</td>
<td>Neptune Drive Crosswalks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5 D</td>
<td>Improve I-880 Overpass Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bicycle & Pedestrian Project Coordination

While pedestrians and bicyclists have very different mobility needs, there are many improvements that can benefit both modes. For example, traffic calming measures that will slow traffic speeds or new traffic signals with video detection will improve both the bicycle and pedestrian environments. However, there are other instances where bicycle or pedestrian improvements can be counterproductive to the other. For example, when widening sidewalks or adding center medians or curb extensions for better pedestrian circulation, these can reduce the road space available to implement bike lanes or wide curb lanes. In these situations, design considerations should account for both modes and strive to enhance both networks as much as possible, given surrounding conditions.

Consequently, it is important to approach the design and implementation of bicycle and pedestrian projects with an eye on how these improvements can be coordinated to benefit both bicyclists and pedestrian as well as provide for a balanced transportation system for all modes.

As shown in Figure 27, there are many bicycle and pedestrian projects in this Plan that overlap geographically. These areas of overlap provide excellent opportunities to coordinate project design and implementation to ensure that the improvements complement each other. A coordinated bicycle and pedestrian project will also be more attractive to potential funding sources. Key overlapping projects include:

- Removal of free-right turn lanes (citywide)
- Traffic calming projects to slow traffic speeds (citywide)
- Neptune Drive/ Monarch Bay Drive/ The Marina area
- Access to Westgate Center
- Manor Boulevard
- Washington Avenue, particularly for an at-grade railroad crossing over the existing tunnel

Bicycle and pedestrian facilities along San Leandro Boulevard.

High Priority Projects

High Priority projects are those that should receive the greatest attention for implementation over the next five years. These projects were selected with the following considerations:

- Projects that rank highest (Phase I) in the bicycle and/or pedestrian prioritization
- Projects that can benefit both bicyclists and pedestrians
- Projects that have the potential for being implemented in the short-term
Figure 27: Recommended Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects
(i.e. ready for implementation, funding sources have been identified or secured, or are part of other projects/development that can partially or fully fund these improvements).

The high priority projects are listed in Table 21. It should be noted that this list is based upon project and funding criteria available at this time and may be adjusted if the City’s priorities or revenues change in future years. In addition, this list does not preclude lower priority projects from being implemented if the opportunity arises.

High priority projects are categorized by two funding sources: 1) Committed Measure B and Measure BB Pass-Through Funds and 3) Competitive Grants including the Active Transportation Program (ATP). A detailed description of potential competitive funding sources available to the City can be found in Appendix D.
## Table 21 - High Priority Bicycle & Pedestrian Projects - 5 Year Expenditure Plan

### Measure B & Measure BB Pass-Through Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Bikeway Class/Ped ID</th>
<th>Description/Location</th>
<th>Conceptual Cost Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle</strong></td>
<td>Class III Boulevard</td>
<td>Farnsworth Street (Vining Drive - Purdue Street)</td>
<td>$91,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class II Buffered</td>
<td>Fairway Drive (Monarch Bay Drive - Alvarado Street)</td>
<td>$356,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class IV</td>
<td>Lewelling Boulevard (Wicks Boulevard - Washington Avenue)</td>
<td>$626,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>Bancroft Avenue (142nd Avenue - 138th Avenue; 136th Avenue - 200 ft S. of Blossom Way; East 14th Street - 136th Avenue)</td>
<td>$62,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian</strong></td>
<td>B-7 B</td>
<td>Improve Crosswalks at Unsignalized Intersections on East 14th Street</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C14</td>
<td>East 14th Street/ San Leandro Boulevard</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C16</td>
<td>Washington Avenue/ Lewelling Boulevard &amp; Lewelling Boulevard/ Tropic Court</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Woodrow Wilson Elementary School/ John Muir Middle School</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C12</td>
<td>McKinley Elementary School</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C9</td>
<td>Corvallis Elementary School</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-4 B</td>
<td>More Crosswalks on Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Competitive Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Bikeway Class/Ped ID</th>
<th>Description/Location</th>
<th>Conceptual Cost Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle</strong></td>
<td>Class IV</td>
<td>Williams Street</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>East Bay Greenway (Thornally Drive-W Broadmoor Boulevard)</td>
<td>$3,715,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class II Buffered</td>
<td>Alvarado Street (Fremont Avenue - Davis Street)</td>
<td>$122,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class III Boulevard</td>
<td>Aurora Drive (Polverosa Avenue - Bermuda Avenue)</td>
<td>$104,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class III Boulevard</td>
<td>Fargo Avenue (Farnsworth Street - Washington Avenue)</td>
<td>$51,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class III Boulevard</td>
<td>Manor Boulevard (Wicks Boulevard - Washington Avenue)</td>
<td>$107,355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Competitive Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Bikeway Class/Ped ID</th>
<th>Description/Location</th>
<th>Conceptual Cost Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>Class III Boulevard</td>
<td>Oakes Boulevard (East 14th Street - MacArthur Boulevard)</td>
<td>$95,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class IV</td>
<td>Washington Avenue (Lloyd Avenue - San Lorenzo Creek)</td>
<td>$430,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-7 D</td>
<td>Implement the Streetscape Improvements Recommended in the East 14th Street South Area Development Strategy</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-5 A</td>
<td>Washington Avenue Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-5 B</td>
<td>Washington Avenue/Halcyon Drive &amp; Lewelling Boulevard crosswalks</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-4 C</td>
<td>Improve Pedestrian Facilities and Accessibility on Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-4 D</td>
<td>Improve Pedestrian Crossings at Farnsworth Street and Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C10</td>
<td>Floresta Boulevard/Monterey Boulevard/Monroe Elementary School</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C13</td>
<td>Bancroft Middle School</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C15</td>
<td>136th Avenue/ Bancroft Avenue</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C29</td>
<td>Bancroft Avenue/Oakes Boulevard</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C7</td>
<td>Pacific Community Recreation Complex</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>Washington Elementary School</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-12 A</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-1 C</td>
<td>Sidewalks and Curb Ramps in the Marina</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Garfield Elementary School</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Jefferson Elementary School</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Cherry Grove Park</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C6</td>
<td>Bonaire Park</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Past Expenditures

Understanding the City’s investment in the existing bikeway and pedestrian system and what is required to complete and maintain the system is important in developing a funding strategy. Since the adoption of the 2010 Plan, San Leandro has invested more than $6 million on pedestrian and bicycle projects throughout the City.

Bikeway Network
With an approximate length of 43.4 miles, the existing bikeway network represents a substantial investment. Completed projects since the previous plan include:
- Bicycle Network East Project
- City Bicycle Rack Program
- Education Programs

PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS
There have been substantial improvements for pedestrians in the years since the 2010 Plan was completed. These projects include:
- Accessible Pedestrian Signals
- Accessible Ramps
- Sidewalk Programs
- San Leandro Boulevard BART Interface
- Bancroft Avenue/136th Avenue Signal and Scramble Crossing
- Education Programs
Bikeway Facility Costs

Estimated costs for the construction and maintenance of the recommended bicycle network projects are discussed below.

Construction Costs

Table 22 provides a unit cost summary for the construction of bikeway facilities in the Bay Area based upon recent bikeway construction and adjusted for conditions in San Leandro. These are conceptual cost estimates only and do not include costs for contingencies, design, administrative costs, or right-of-way acquisition. More detailed estimates should be developed following the preliminary engineering stage as individual projects advance towards implementation.

Bikeway construction estimates are based on a per-mile rate that includes related construction costs and materials. This includes costs for bike lanes on both sides of the roadway. In lieu of providing numeric estimates for pedestrian recommendations, categorical estimates are provided instead: low cost, moderate cost, and high cost. Given the highly variable and site-specific nature of pedestrian improvements, providing a rough dollar estimate can be misleading as it cannot account for site specific conditions that alter design, materials, and pricing.

Table 22 - Conceptual Unit Cost Estimates for Bikeway Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bikeway Conceptual Cost Estimates</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Cost per Mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I Shared-Use Path</td>
<td>$1,125,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Bike Lane</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Buffered Bike Lane</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Bicycle Boulevard</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class IV Separated Bikeway</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of network cost by bikeway classification is presented in Table 23. These costs are based upon the assumptions outlined above.

Table 23 - Conceptual Unit Cost Estimates for San Leandro Recommended Bikeway Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bikeway Conceptual Cost Estimates</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Proposed Segments (mi)</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I Shared-Use Path</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>$6,918,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Bike Lane</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>$292,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Buffered Bike Lane</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>$774,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>$92,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Bicycle Boulevard</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td>$1,073,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class IV Separated Bikeway</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>$4,860,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction along East 14th Street for East Bay BRT.
Construction of the on-street Class II, Class III, and Class IV facilities would require approximately $4,688,500, which equates to an investment of approximately $234,425 per year over 20 years. Although a portion of the proposed system would be constructed as new development or re-development occurs, a substantial amount of the total cost will rely on public funding. The funding strategy is discussed in the next section.

It is anticipated that construction of Class I facilities would be primarily funded by outside grant sources and partnerships with other agencies, with land acquisition costs contributing towards local match requirements. Construction of the proposed Class I shared-use paths would require an estimated investment of approximately $4,950,000 (although actual costs will vary depending on the level of amenities, such as landscaping and lighting) and, of course, costs for land acquisition. Funding for East Bay Greenway has currently not been determined and will likely be a multi-agency effort with the Alameda County Transportation Commission as lead.

**Maintenance Costs**

Multi-use path maintenance includes cleaning, resurfacing, and restriping the asphalt path, repairing bridges and other structures, cleaning the drainage system, removing trash, and maintaining landscaping. While this maintenance effort may not be incrementally major, it does have the potential to develop heavy expenses if it is not done periodically.

For purposes of estimating maintenance expenses for paved pathways, $8,500 per mile per year is assumed based on information received for other similar facilities in California. This cost covers all expenses including labor, supplies, and amortized equipment costs. Tasks include trash removal, sweeping (with a mechanized sweeper), sign replacement/repair, pavement marking replacement, pavement sealing/resurfacing, and structural and drainage inspection. Underbrush and weeds should be removed to maintain a clear pathway.

Sections with narrow widths or other clearance restrictions should be clearly marked. Pathways should be designed to accommodate City maintenance vehicles and emergency vehicles.

Maintenance for Class II bike lanes and Class III bike routes can generally be provided as part of the regular roadway maintenance. Additional costs should be minimal because, in most locations, the roadway surface area to be maintained will be the same with or without bike lanes or routes. For estimating purposes, maintenance costs for Class II, Class III, and Class IV facilities would include:

- **Class II** at $2,000/mile annually for sweeping, sign and stripe/pavement marking maintenance, and minor surface repairs. Buffered bike lanes may have additional maintenance costs due to the additional striping that needs to be maintained.
- **Class III** at $1,000/mile annually for sweeping, signage maintenance, and minor surface repairs. Bicycle Boulevards may have additional costs, dependent on a street’s specific treatments.
- **Class IV** facilities are priced similar to Class II facilities, but may require additional capital to maintain and clean. The City may need to purchase specialty (micro) street sweepers or investigate other cleaning/maintenance methods to accommodate the spatial limits of the bikeway.
Funding Strategy

While high priority/near-term projects were identified earlier in this section, this does not mean that the remaining projects must wait until these high priority projects are implemented. Rather, due to the variety of ways projects can be funded and constructed, all the projects in this Plan should be considered important. If one of the opportunities discussed below arises that could implement any of these bikeways or pedestrian projects within the scope of another project, the project should be included. With this understanding, the following options should be considered by the City for fulfilling the funding commitment necessary to complete the proposed bikeway network and pedestrian improvements:

- Use the ‘funding experts’ available at the State, county and regional agencies to keep apprised of upcoming funding opportunities.
- Prepare joint applications with other local and regional agencies for competitive funding programs at the State and federal levels. Joint applications often increase the competitiveness of projects for funding; however, coordination amongst the participating jurisdictions is often challenging. The City should consider acting as the lead agency, with a strong emphasis on coordination between participating jurisdictions to ensure that important projects are implemented as quickly as possible.
- Use existing funding sources as matching funds for State and federal funding.
- Include bikeway and pedestrian projects in local traffic impact fee programs and assessment districts.
- Continue to include proposed bikeways and pedestrian improvements as part of roadways projects involving repaving, widening, overlays, or other improvements. For example, when an arterial or collector is scheduled for repaving, re-evaluate roadway and lane configurations to fit bike lanes wherever possible. If necessary, consider restriping for narrower inside travel lanes or reducing the number of travel lanes. If bike lanes are still not possible, provide other traffic calming measures.

There are a variety of potential funding sources including local, State and federal. The City should also take advantage of private contributions in developing the proposed system. This could include a variety of resources such as volunteer labor during construction or monetary donations towards specific improvements. The funding sources considered appropriate for San Leandro are discussed in detail in Appendix D.
Implementation Strategy

This section outlines various implementation actions recommended in support of the bicycle network and pedestrian improvements and to measure success of the bicycle and pedestrian program.

Staffing and Support

**Bicycle/Pedestrian Program Coordinator:** Continue to designate existing staff (Transportation Engineer or Planner) to this role to be responsible for plan review, coordination with city and outside agency staff, and overall implementation of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC):** Continue to utilize the BPAC as an on-going advocacy, review, and implementation team and as support for City staff in implementation of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. The BPAC should meet regularly and should be kept informed by City Staff of all relevant projects/policies.

Plan Review

All traffic impact studies, street improvement projects, land use changes and development projects should be routed through appropriate City staff (and the BPAC, if appropriate) to ensure that bikeway projects and pedestrian improvements are implemented, developer impact fees are identified (if applicable), and design guidelines presented in this Plan and the city’s complete street policies are met. The review should also include an assessment of impacts to existing bicycle and pedestrian safety, access, and mobility; and, strategies to mitigate any impacts.

Monitoring

A monitoring plan for implementation of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan should be put into place as the responsibility of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Program Coordinator. The monitoring plan may include the following activities:

- **Collision Monitoring:** Bicycle and pedestrian related collision data from the Police Department should be evaluated every three to six months and tabulated to show patterns by location and collision type.

- **Funding Monitoring:** The Coordinator should work closely with various funding agencies such as Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Alameda County Transportation Commission, California Transportation Commission, and Caltrans to keep abreast of funding opportunities and to follow up on applications to ensure maximum success.

- **Operations Monitoring:** In cooperation with the Police Department, the Coordinator should be responsible for directing needed enforcement along bike paths (issues of security, privacy, vandalism, and crime) as well as enforcement of traffic laws affecting bicyclists and pedestrians on city streets.
Maintenance

A regular maintenance program should maintain bicycle and pedestrian facilities in good, usable condition. This program should include:

- Annual review of bicycle facilities to assess the condition and needed repair or replacement of signage, striping, or pavement markings.
- Regular sweeping of on-street and off-street facilities no less than four times a year. Obstructions and potholes should be repaired as soon as possible after being reported.
- A pedestrian and bicycle facility improvement and maintenance log in the Public Works Department where all observed and recorded hazardous conditions are listed and scheduled for repair or replacement. This list would include all grates and railroad crossings that do not meet specific criteria.
- The program coordinator should be responsible for the annual maintenance and operations budget, collaborating with the Public Works Department. The Coordinator should keep track of long term path maintenance, schedule repairs, and respond to calls from the public or staff regarding maintenance needs.

Coordination with Other Agencies

The lines of communication regarding issues affecting bicyclists and pedestrians should be established with other City Departments (Police, Public Works, and Recreation and Human Services), county and regional agencies responsible for funding and implementation of the county/regional bikeway networks, and adjacent communities to ensure that all opportunities for implementation of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan are utilized.

Outreach

The general public and interested parties should be kept apprised of successes and opportunities for bicycling and walking in San Leandro. Some strategies include:

- Bicycle and pedestrian promotional and educational events, such as Bike to Work Day and Walk a Child to School Day.
- Updates to the City’s website on new or renovated facilities.
- Create and maintain a mailing list of organizations and individuals that will support events and efforts by the City to encourage bicycling and walking.
- Implement a volunteer maintenance program where the City organizes regular work parties and provides technical and logistical support. Bikeways may be “adopted” by corporations or clubs and maintained by them in exchange for public acknowledgment.
- Continue and promote the bicycle rack program where the City supplies and installs bicycle racks on public right-of-way (ROW) at the request of adjacent business owners and residents.
- Create a bikeway identity by adopting a unique logo for bikeway signage, brochures, maps, and other materials. The logo would help define the bikeway routes as a cohesive system rather than a series of disconnected routes. The design may be accomplished through a contest involving local schools and bicycle clubs, with a prize awarded to the winner. Wayfinding, informational, and warning signs should conform to the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) unless superseded by City guidelines.
- Use the map of the San Leandro Bikeway Network to promote bicycling and educate bicyclists and motorists on the rules of the road and other safety information. The cost of printing and updating this map could be subsidized by advertising revenues from local bike shops and other
Listening to the public was a critical component of developing the recommendations for this plan.

- Distribution of the map may include local bike shops, libraries, schools, and major employers as well as an online resource for use by business in their promotional outreach programs.

- Produce brochures for residents, schools and employers addressing opportunities for safe routes to school programs, employer incentive programs for walking and bicycling to work, and tips for bicycling/walking with your children.

- Serve as an example for walking and bicycling by developing City programs for employee incentives, secure and convenient bicycle parking (such as electronic lockers or a bike cage for employees), walking and bicycling events, and adopting walking and bicycling goals for employees and elected officials.
Appendix A: Existing Policy Documents

Local Plans

**San Leandro 2035 General Plan (2016)**
The General Plan is the guiding policy document for all current and future (2035) City land use and development actions. Its Land use, transportation, open space, parks and conservation, historic preservation and community design sections contain goals, policies, and action items to manage existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities and steer future projects to improve walking and cycling conditions.

**City of San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (2010)**
This document provides an update of the 2010 Bicycle Master Plan. It includes a recommended bikeway network, discussion of safety and education programs, key pedestrian improvement locations, and prioritization methodology for bikeway and pedestrian projects.

**San Leandro Complete Streets Policy (2013)**
The Complete Streets Policy outlines the vision that the streets should be designed and operated to be safe and accessible for all transportation users whether they are pedestrian, bicyclists, transit riders, or vehicular motorists regardless of age or ability.

**San Leandro Next Generation Workplace Districts (2013)**
The Next Generation Workplace Districts provides information about how the City envisions its changing employment base; moving away from heavy industrial uses and increasing office, particularly high tech jobs. The plan discusses transportation-related improvements that would best suit each workplace environment.

**Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy (2007)**
The Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy is a set of guidelines for establishing a transit-oriented redevelopment district in the vicinity of Downtown San Leandro and the Downtown San Leandro BART Station. The primary goals of the plan are to increase transit ridership and enhance Downtown San Leandro. The plan emphasizes non-automotive transportation as a primary means of circulation in the downtown area and details numerous strategies for improving walking and cycling conditions, including a downtown bike-friendly zone.

Downtown San Leandro's Design Guidelines and Principles presents a collection of urban design concepts, building façade treatments, and streetscape improvements intended to make Downtown San Leandro a more inviting, pedestrian-oriented commercial district. The guidelines are intended to govern retrofits of existing buildings as well as new development.

**San Leandro BART Station Access Plan (2002)**
This plan lays out existing conditions about how people accessed the San Leandro BART station and provides recommendation on how to improve access which includes: streetscape improvements and improved wayfinding and bike facilities.

**MacArthur Boulevard Streetscape Study (2001)**
This document developed a streetscape plan for the commercial corridor on MacArthur Blvd extending from the City of Oakland border for approximately
6,000 feet south in San Leandro. The study provided design elements to provide an attractive, pedestrian oriented setting for commercial activity by slowing traffic speeds, enhancing pedestrian safety and improving visibility of fronting businesses.


The Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines provides specifics about how to design various bikeway and pedestrian facilities. These design guidelines also provides information about bicycle and pedestrian amenities such as bike racks and corrals and street lights.

**Regional Plans**


The San Francisco Bay Trail Project is administered and funded by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). The San Francisco Bay Trail Plan is the guiding vision for a regional recreational corridor that, when complete, will encircle San Francisco and San Pablo Bays with a continuous 400-mile network of bicycling and hiking trails. It will connect the shoreline of all nine Bay Area counties, link 47 cities, and cross the major toll bridges in the region. To date, approximately 240 miles of the alignment have been completed. The main component of the Bay Trail, the “spine trail,” parallels the shoreline through San Leandro and traverses the Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline and San Leandro Marina areas; additional spur trails extend to inland neighborhoods.

**Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan (2012)**

The Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan presents a network of cross-county bike routes. The Plan includes goals and objectives targeted at integrating bicycling with key destinations and other travel modes, promoting safety and awareness of bicycle transportation, improving existing high-usage bicycle corridors, and identifying new bike routes. Alameda countywide bicycle routes are corridors that traverse multiple local roadways or trails with the intent of creating continuous, long-distance bicycle routes.

**Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan for Unincorporated Areas (2012)**

The Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan for Unincorporated Areas includes a parallel set of goals and objectives to those of the main Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans. Whereas the main Countywide Plan focuses on primary bicycle routes and regional connectivity, the Bicycle Plan for Unincorporated Areas presents local bicycle networks and proposed projects for areas not included within incorporated cities, such as the San Lorenzo and Castro Valley areas south and east of San Leandro, respectively.

**Alameda Countywide Strategic Pedestrian Plan (2012)**

Like the Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan, the Countywide Strategic Pedestrian Plan identifies a vision with goals and objectives that targets and prioritizes pedestrian projects of countywide significance. By improving walking facilities, connectivity, and safety, the Plan aims to increase the volume of walking trips in Alameda County. The Plan also includes a companion piece, the Toolkit for Improving Walkability in Alameda County, which offers strategies to enhance walking and walkability through policy, planning, design standards, education, and programs.
Alameda County Multimodal Arterial Plan (2016)
This countywide multimodal arterial plan envisions a robust system of transportation options operating on a continuous and connected countywide network for each mode that best supports adjacent land uses. In this plan, pedestrian improvements are focused near BART stations and along major transit hubs and corridors. The plan includes 150 miles of “high comfort” bikeways.

Central County Complete Streets Implementation Design Guidelines (2016)
This Design Guide is based on the 2016 Alameda County Transportation Commission Multimodal Arterial plan. The Arterial Plan provides the top two modal priorities for each major arterial corridor; the design guide provides design examples and specific design elements that fit the particular modal priorities of each corridor type.

Alameda Countywide Transit Plan (2016)
This countywide transit plan envisions increasing transit mode share, effectiveness, cost efficiency, reduce emissions, improving access to work, education, services, and recreation, and achieving a state of good repair. The document reports that 2/3rds of all trips that originate within Alameda County stay within the County. In order, the most frequented other counties are: Contra Costa, San Francisco, Santa Clara, and San Mateo Counties.

Alameda County Goods Movement Plan (2016)
This plan discusses the importance of the Port of Oakland (5th busiest port in America, with potential to grow) and also explains the major freight corridors (both truck and rail).

East Bay Greenway Study (2008)
The East Bay Greenway is a proposal for a bicycle/pedestrian path along the Union Pacific Railroad Oakland Subdivision/BART right-of-way between Oakland and Hayward. The trail, which would run along the west side of existing railroad tracks in San Leandro, would provide a continuous north-south non-motorized corridor through the city and link San Leandro and Bay Fair BART stations.

UPRR Oakland Subdivision Corridor Improvement Study (2009)
Like the East Bay Greenway study before it, the UPRR Corridor Improvement Study examines the feasibility of a bicycle/pedestrian path along the Oakland Subdivision; however, the UPRR Corridor Improvement Study extends the study area to include the area between Fruitvale and Union City BART stations.

San Leandro Creek Master Plan (2017)
The San Leandro Creek Master Plan was created to plan for a trail along (or nearby) a six-mile stretch of the San Leandro Creek between the Lake Chabot Dam and San Leandro Bay. The study area includes both the Cities of Oakland and San Leandro. The Plan proposes facilities both along the banks and along nearby streets to create a path that loosely follows the San Leandro Creek.

State Plans

Caltrans Highway Design Manual (2016)
The Caltrans Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000: Bikeway Planning and Design, sets the basic minimums for bike lane and trail widths. It also establishes policies for the type and placement of signs.
California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD 2014)
The CA MUTCD provides guidelines for all traffic control devices, which include "signs, signals, markings, and other devices used to regulate, warn, or guide traffic, placed on, over, or adjacent to a street, highway, pedestrian facility, or bikeway by authority of a public agency having jurisdiction." The CA MUTCD offers standard design configurations for the placement of traffic control devices as they relate to bikeways.

Project Development Procedures Manual (2016)
The Project Development Procedures Manual, Chapter 31: Non-Motorized Transportation Facilities, defines the means by which local jurisdictions may receive Caltrans approval for State-funded projects.

Towards an Active California: State Active Transportation Plan (2017)
Towards an Active California is the state's first active transportation plan. The plan lays out the policies and actions that Caltrans and its partner agencies will take to achieve the department's ambitious statewide goals to double walking and triple bicycling trips by 2020.

California Vehicle Code
The California Vehicle Code (CVC) has several sections related to bicycle and pedestrian operation while also granting local jurisdictions leeway to create their own policies. Section 21200 establishes bicyclists' right to share the road with vehicles, and makes them subject to the same rules and regulations as drivers. This section also defines conditions under which a bicyclist may "take the lane," as well as instances when drivers are allowed in bike lanes. The CVC includes standard specifications for bicycles, including brakes and reflective devices, as well as general safety guidelines and helmet requirements for riders under 18 years of age. Finally, Sections 3900-3911 create a bicycle licensing program, through which cities, if they choose, may request licensing forms from the State, to be distributed through local bicycle vendors when bicycles are sold. While few California cities currently have bicycle licensing programs, there is a well-established program in Chicago, Illinois. The success of a bicycle licensing program is dependent upon extensive public awareness, achieved through public education campaigns.

California Vehicle Code Section 467 defines a "pedestrian" as any person who is afoot or who is using a means of conveyance propelled by human power other than a bicycle. "Pedestrian" includes any person who is operating a self-propelled wheelchair, invalid tricycle, or motorized quadricycle and, by reason of physical disability, is otherwise unable to move about as a pedestrian, as specified in subdivision. The Vehicle Code also identifies pedestrians' rights and responsibilities when crossing the street, including where it is legal to cross the street and the amount of "due care" required of pedestrians when entering the roadway. The Code also discusses when motorists must yield to pedestrians and vice versa.
Federal/Nationwide Plans & Guides

**FAST ACT (2015)**

The Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act provides long-term funding certainty for surface transportation infrastructure planning and investment. The FAST ACT authorizes $305 billion over fiscal years 2016 through 2020, maintaining a focus on safety.

**AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities**

The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities offers planning and design guidance for the development of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The Guide covers topics ranging from high-level bikeway network planning to specific facility design.

**NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide**

The NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide provides cities with state-of-the-practice solutions that can help create complete streets that are safe and enjoyable for bicyclists.

**Americans with Disabilities Act (1990)**

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provides thorough civil liberties protections to individuals with disabilities with regards to employment, State and local government services, access to public accommodations, transportation, and telecommunications.

Title III of the act requires places of public accommodation to be accessible and usable to all people, including those with disabilities. While the letter of the law applies to “public accommodations,” the spirit of the law applies not only to public agencies but to all facilities serving the public, whether they are publicly or privately funded.

Title II of the act requires that all government services, programs, and activities be accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. However, Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Section 35.150(a), states that if the public entity can demonstrate that modifications would fundamentally alter the nature of its service, program, or activity, or cause undue financial and administrative burdens, it is not required to make that particular modification.
# Appendix B: Project Prioritization Worksheets

**Bicycle Project Prioritization Worksheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) CONNECTION TO ACTIVITY CENTERS: How is access to key destinations improved by this project? The project will provide access to:</th>
<th>Circle all that apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Schools</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Major employment centers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Major shopping centers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Libraries</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Park or recreational facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2) Safety: How does the project improve bicycle safety?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) The project includes an intersection or roadway segment with a high number of bicycle collisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) The project provides an alternative to or separation for bicyclists on a busy arterial street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3) Connectivity: How will the project improve connectivity for bicyclists?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) The project eliminates an existing barrier or hazard to bicycle access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) The project bridges a gap in an existing bikeway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) The project connects to an existing bikeway on both ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) The project connects to an existing or proposed bikeway on both ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) The project is located on or connects to the regional, county or Bay Trail network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) The project connects to an existing or proposed bikeway in neighboring jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) The project is part of a bikeway that passes through the entire city.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4) Transit Access: How does the project improve bicycle access to transit?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) The project connects to a BART station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) The project connects to a existing high capacity bus line or future BRT service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) The project connects to a local bus route.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5) Funding &amp; Implementation: Will the project be reasonably easy to implement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) The project can be implemented without extensive additional planning or study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) The project does not require extensive modifications to implement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Bicycle Project Prioritization Worksheet

| C) The project can be implemented as part of a defined current or future development or redevelopment project. | 1 |
| D) The project can be implemented without coordination with agencies outside the City. | 1 |
| E) The project would be competitive for County, State or federal funding sources. | 1 |
| F) The project would be eligible for the Safe-Routes-to-School or Safe-Routes-to-Transit program. | 1 |
| G) The project has community support (i.e. is already included in city, county, or regional adopted planning documents or has been identified or initiated by community input or request.) | 1 |
| **Total Score Out of 27 Possible Points** | |

### Prioritization of Projects

**Phase I Projects (14+ points)** Projects that scored within this category are considered the highest priority for implementation. These projects should receive priority and should be targeted for completion within five years.

**Phase II Projects (10 to 13 points)** Projects that score within this category are considered moderate priority and should be targeted for completion within 10 years.

**Phase III Projects (1 to 9 points)** Projects that score within this category are considered the lowest relative priority and should be targeted for completion within 10 to 20 years.
### Pedestrian Project Prioritization Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1) Accessibility:</strong> How is accessibility improved by this project?</th>
<th>Circle all that apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) The project will create accessibility in a location that was previously inaccessible.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) The project will remove a major barrier/obstacle to accessibility in the citywide Pedestrian Network.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) The project will include design features that are beyond the minimum required by ADA, i.e. extra wide sidewalks, verbal audible signals.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2) Safety:</strong> How does the project improve pedestrian safety?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) The project is located at an intersection with a high number of pedestrian collisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) The project is located within 1,500 feet of a school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) The project includes additional design features to increase pedestrian safety, i.e. pedestrian refuge islands, bulbouts, pedestrian actuated signals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3) Connectivity:</strong> How will the project improve connectivity? The project is located near a:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Major employment center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Major shopping center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Park or recreation facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Major transit route/stop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>4) Walkability:</strong> How does the project improve the pedestrian environment and encourage walking?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) The project includes pedestrian amenities such as seating, lighting and trash receptacles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) The project creates plazas, or open spaces that will allow for public gatherings and encourage pedestrian use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>5) Funding &amp; Implementation:</strong> Will the project be reasonably easy to implement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) The project can be implemented without extensive additional planning or study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) The project does not require extensive modifications to implement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) The project can be implemented as part of another development or redevelopment project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) The project can be implemented without coordination with agencies outside the City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pedestrian Project Prioritization Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E) The project is eligible for County, State or federal funding sources.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) The project would be eligible for the Safe-Routes-to-School or Safe-Routes-to-Transit program.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) The project has community support (i.e. is already included in city, county, or regional adopted planning documents or has been identified or initiated by community input or request.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Score Out of 24 Possible Points

#### Prioritization of Projects

**Phase I Projects (14+ points)** Projects that scored within this category are considered the highest priority for implementation. These projects should receive priority and should be targeted for completion within five years.

**Phase II Projects (9 to 13 points)** Projects that score within this category are considered moderate priority and should be targeted for completion within 10 years.

**Phase III Projects (1 to 8 points)** Projects that score within this category are considered the lowest relative priority and should be targeted for completion within 10 to 20 years.
## Appendix C: ATP Compliance Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Section(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Trips</td>
<td>The estimated number of existing bicycle trips in the plan area and the estimated increase in the number of bicycle trips resulting from implementation of the Plan.</td>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>The number and location of collisions, serious injuries, and fatalities suffered by bicycle riders in the Plan area, both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of all collisions and injuries, and a goal for collision, serious injury, and fatality reduction after implementation of the Plan.</td>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>A map and description of existing and proposed land use and settlement patterns which must include, but not be limited to, locations of residential neighborhoods, schools, shopping centers, public buildings, major employment centers, and other major destinations.</td>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeways</td>
<td>A map and description of existing and potential bicycle transportation facilities.</td>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>A map and description of existing and potential end-of-trip bicycle parking facilities.</td>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>A description of existing and proposed policies related to bicycle parking in public locations, private parking garages and parking lots, and in new commercial and residential developments.</td>
<td>Chapters 2, 3, 4, &amp; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Modal Connections</td>
<td>A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transportation and parking facilities for connections with and use of other transportation modes. These shall include, but not be limited to, parking facilities at transit stops, rail and transit terminals, ferry docks and landings, park and ride lots, and provisions for transporting bicycle riders and bicycles on transit or rail vehicles or ferry vessels.</td>
<td>Chapters 3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td>A map and description of existing and proposed facilities for changing and storing clothes and equipment. These shall include, but not be limited to, locker, restroom, and shower facilities near bicycle parking facilities.</td>
<td>Chapters 3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding</td>
<td>A description of proposed signage providing wayfinding along the bicycle transportation network to designated destinations.</td>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>A description of the policies and procedures for maintaining existing and proposed bicycle facilities, including, but not limited to, the maintenance of smooth pavement, freedom from encroaching vegetation, maintenance of traffic control devices including striping and other pavement markings, and lighting.</td>
<td>Chapters 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Active Transportation Program Compliance Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Section(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>A description of bicycle safety and education programs conducted in the area included within the Plan, efforts by the law enforcement agency having primary traffic law enforcement responsibility in the area to enforce provisions of the law impacting bicycle rider safety, and the resulting effect on collisions involving bicycle riders.</td>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement</td>
<td>A description of the extent of community involvement in development of the Plan, including disadvantaged and underserved communities.</td>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Coordination</td>
<td>A description of how the active transportation plan has been coordinated with neighboring jurisdictions, including school districts within the Plan area, and is consistent with other local or regional transportation, air quality, or energy conservation plans, including, but not limited to, general plans and a Sustainable Community Strategy in a Regional Transportation Plan.</td>
<td>Chapters 1, 3, &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization</td>
<td>A description of the projects and programs proposed in the Plan and a listing of their priorities for implementation, including the methodology for project prioritization and a proposed timeline for implementation.</td>
<td>Chapter 6 and Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>A description of past expenditures for bicycle facilities and programs, and future financial needs for projects and programs that improve safety and convenience for bicycle riders in the Plan area. Include anticipated revenue sources and potential grant funding for bicycle uses.</td>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>A description of steps necessary to implement the Plan and the reporting process that will be used to keep the adopting agency and community informed of the progress being made in implementing the Plan.</td>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Adoption</td>
<td>A resolution showing adoption of the Plan by the Council of Governments.</td>
<td>Appendix G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Funding Sources

Federal Funding (competitive grants)

United States Department of Transportation (USDOT)

TIGER (TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT GENERATING ECONOMIC RECOVERY)

TIGER is a highly competitive, annual discretionary grant program that funds innovative, multimodal, and multi-jurisdictional transportation projects that are difficult to fund through traditional federal programs. Successful TIGER projects leverage resources, encourage partnership, catalyze investment and growth, fill a critical void in the transportation system or provide a substantial benefit to the nation, region or metropolitan area in which the project is located.

Eligible projects for TIGER Discretionary Grants are capital projects that include, but are not limited to: 1) highway or bridge projects eligible under title 23, United States Code (including bicycle and pedestrian related projects); 2) public transportation projects eligible under chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code; 3) passenger and freight rail transportation projects; 4) port infrastructure investments (including inland port infrastructure); and 5) intermodal projects.

Minimum/Maximum Grant Amounts: $5 Million/$100 Million
Required Local Match: 20%
Website: https://www.transportation.gov/tiger

State Funding* (competitive grants)

California Transportation Commission (CTC)

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (ATP)

The Active Transportation Program was created to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking and walking. The ATP consolidates various transportation programs, including the federal Transportation Alternatives Program, state Bicycle Transportation Account, and federal and state Safe Routes to School Programs, into a single program. Program funding is segregated into three components and is distributed as follows: 50% to the state for a statewide competitive program (25% of which must benefit disadvantaged communities), 10% to small urban and rural regions with populations of 200,000 or less for the small urban and rural area competitive program (25% of which must benefit disadvantaged communities), and 40% to MPOs in urban areas with populations greater than 200,000 for the large urbanized area competitive program (25% of which must benefit disadvantaged communities).

Infrastructure Projects: SR2S that improve safety of children, Safe Routes to Transit, Bikeways and walkways (new, improved, hazard elimination, maintenance), Traffic control devices (new pedestrian signals, RRFBs, protected left turn movements, road diets, etc.), Secure bike parking, Bikes on transit; Recreational trails/trailheads, Park linkages to corridors, and Rails-to-trails. Non-Infrastructure: Educational Programs and other non-infrastructure projects that demonstrate effectiveness in increasing active transportation. SRTS Projects in accordance with Section 1404 of Public Law 109-59. Plans: ATP, Bike, Pedestrian, and SR2S

Minimum/Maximum Grant Amounts: $250,000 minimum
Required Local Match: 11.47%
Website: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/atp/
California Transportation Commission (CTC)

**SOLUTIONS FOR CONGESTED CORRIDORS PROGRAMS**


Minimum/Maximum Grant Amounts: Varies
Required Local Match: Varies
Website: [http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=29407](http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=29407)

**Caltrans**

**HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP)**

The FAST Act continues the HSIP program to achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads, including non-State-owned public roads on tribal lands. The HSIP requires a data-driven, strategic approach to improving highway safety on all public roads that focuses on performance. Items on the inclusion list include: 1) Installation of vehicle-to-infrastructure communication equipment, 2) Pedestrian hybrid beacons, 3) Roadway improvements that provide separation between pedestrians and motor vehicles, including medians and pedestrian crossing islands, 4) Other physical infrastructure projects not specifically enumerated in the list of eligible projects.

Federal Agency: Federal Highway Administration
Minimum/Maximum Grant Amounts: $100,000/$10,000,000
Required Local Match: 10%
Website: [http://dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hsip.html](http://dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hsip.html)

**SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING GRANT PROGRAM (STP)**

The Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Program was created to support the California Department of Transportation’s (Caltrans’) Mission: Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability. The Grant programs overarching objectives were also identified to ensure consideration of these major efforts in transportation planning, including: sustainability, preservation, mobility, safety, innovation, economy, health, and equity. The Caltrans Division of Transportation Planning provides the following transportation planning grants: strategic partnerships, sustainable communities for MPOs & RTPAs, sustainable communities for cities, counties, transit agencies, and tribal governments.

**Strategic Partnerships:**

Federal Agency: Federal Highway Administration
Minimum/Maximum Grant Amounts: $100,000/$500,000
Required Local Match: 11.47% or 20% dependent on grant
Website: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html)

*Federal dollars are often times distributed through State and Regional agencies/programs. Federal policies may still apply.*
Sustainable Communities:
Federal Agency: Federal Transit Administration
Minimum/Maximum Grant Amounts: $50,000/$500,000
Required Local Match: 11.47% or 20% dependent on grant
Website: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html

California State Transportation Agency
OFFICE OF TRAFFIC SAFETY: NATIONAL SAFETY PROGRAM 405(H) NONMOTORIZED SAFETY
Under FAST Act Section 405 is the National Priority Safety Program, which provides grant funding to address selected national priorities for reducing highway deaths and injuries. 5% of Section 405 funds are earmarked for nonmotorized safety incentive grants. States can submit their Section 405 application on July 1 as part of the consolidated application process. Grant funds may only be used for: 1) Training law enforcement on state laws applicable to pedestrian and bicycle safety 2) Enforcement mobilizations and campaigns designed to enforce those state laws 3) Public education and awareness programs designed to inform motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists of those laws.
Minimum/Maximum Grant Amounts: Varies
Required Local Match: 20%
Website: http://www.ots.ca.gov/Grants/Pedestrian_and_Bicycle_Safety.asp

Department of Parks & Recreation
RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM
The RTP is a Federal-aid assistance program of the U.S. Department of Transportation's Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to help the States provide and maintain recreational trails for both motorized and nonmotorized trail use. Eligible projects include: Trail maintenance and restoration, trailside and trailhead facilities, equipment for construction and maintenance, construction of new recreational trails, acquisition of trail corridors, assessment of trail conditions, safety and environmental education, and administration.
Federal Agency: Federal Highway Administration
Minimum/Maximum Grant Amounts: Varies
Required Local Match: 12%
Website: http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=24324

grant program both focus around reducing collisions, injuries, and fatalities for pedestrian and bicyclists in addition to increase bicycle helmet compliance for youth.
Minimum/Maximum Grant Amounts: Varies
Required Local Match: Varies
Website: http://www.ots.ca.gov/Grants/Pedestrian_and_Bicycle_Safety.asp
Department of Parks & Recreation

LAND & WATER CONSERVATION FUND (LWCF)

The LWCF program is administered by the NPS at the federal level and the California Department of Parks and Recreation at the state level. Funding sources include: Outer Continental Shelf mineral receipts, sales of federal surplus real property, federal recreation fees, and federal motorboat fuel taxes. Eligible projects must meet certain priorities in the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). This plan is updated every five years to evaluate demand, supply, and priorities to protect existing and create new public outdoor recreation resources. At least one of the SCORP priorities must be met for NPS to approve a project. Projects addressing more than one priority will be more competitive.

Development projects must be used to increase outdoor recreational opportunities. Examples can include: athletic fields and courts, community gardens, non-motorized neighborhood and regional recreational trails, open space and natural areas, outdoor gyms, outdoor performing arts venues, picnic areas, playgrounds, tot lots, skate parks, and outdoor swimming pools and aquatic features.

Federal Agency: National Park Service

Minimum/Maximum Grant Amounts: Lowest acceptable amount/$2,000,000

Required Local Match: 50%

Website: https://www.nps.gov/subjects/lwcf/stateside.htm

Regional Funding

Bay Area Air Quality Management District

BICYCLE FACILITIES GRANT PROGRAM

The goal of this program is to reduce air emissions from on-road motor vehicles and to improve air quality by helping residents and commuters mode-shift to cycling and walking as alternatives to driving for short distances and first-and last-mile trips. During the FYE 2017 Cycle up to $5 million in funds were available for this competitive program.

Minimum/Maximum Grant Amounts: $10,000 per project/$1,500,000 per agency

Required Local Match: 10%

Website: http://www.baaqmd.gov/grant-funding/public-agencies/bikeways-roads-lanes-paths

The Air District has additional grant programs that can provide funding for bicycle parking facilities.

Save the Bay Restoration Authority

MEASURE AA

During the 2016 election cycle, all nine Bay Area counties passed Measure AA, a $12 per year parcel tax to protect San Francisco Bay for future generations by reducing trash, pollution and harmful toxins, improving water quality, restoring habitat for fish, birds and wildlife, protecting communities from floods, and increasing shoreline public access.

The purpose of the Shoreline Public Access Program funded under the Measure is to enhance the quality of life of Bay Area residents, including those
with disabilities, through safer and improved public access, as part of and compatible with wildlife habitat restoration projects in and around the Bay: A) Construct new, repair existing and/or replace deteriorating public access trails, signs, and related facilities along the shoreline and manage these public access facilities and B) Provide interpretive materials and special outreach events about pollution prevention, wildlife habitat, public access, and flood protection, to protect the Bay's health and encourage community engagement.

Minimum/Maximum Grant Amounts: TBD
Required Local Match: TDB
Website: http://sfbayrestore.org/sf-bay-restoration-authority-grants.php

Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)

ONE BAY AREA GRANT PROGRAM 2

One Bay Area integrated the region’s federal transportation program with California’s climate laws and the Sustainable Communities Strategy, by targeting funding to Priority Development Areas (PDAs), Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs), and Climate Initiatives while maintaining commitments to existing transportation priorities. Known as OBAG 2 for short, the second round of OBAG funding is projected to total roughly $916 million to fund projects from 2017-18 through 2021-22. The OBAG 2 program is divided into a Regional Program, managed by MTC, and County Program, managed by the nine Bay Area Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs).

The County Program will provide over $386 million over five years. Cities and counties can invest in: local street and road maintenance, streetscape enhancements, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, safe routes to school projects, priority conservation areas, and transportation planning. These funds are targeted to projects in PDAs to support efforts for focused growth. In the case of San Leandro, these funds will be managed by the Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC).

Minimum/Maximum Grant Amounts: TBD
Required Local Match: TDB
Website: http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/8495
Local Funding

Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC)

MEASURES B & BB
Measure B & BB are county transportation sales tax measures that provide monthly direct local distributions to local jurisdictions and transit agencies. Some of these funds are dedicated for pedestrian and bicycle projects. Measure B is projected to provide San Leandro with approximately $260,000 in funds annually and Measure BB is projected to provide San Leandro with approximately $215,000 annually for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

Website: http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/4134

Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC)

TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLE 3
Transportation Development Act Article 3, or TDA 3, provides funding annually for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Two percent of TDA funds collected in the county is used for TDA 3. MTC allows each county to determine how to use funds in their county. MTC requires that all projects submitted for funding be reviewed by a Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC).


NEW DEVELOPMENT OR REDEVELOPMENT
Future new development and redevelopment projects including new roads, road widening and construction projects are one method of providing pedestrian improvements and bike lanes. To ensure that pedestrian and bicycle improvements are included in these projects, it is important that the review process includes an individual (designated bicycle coordinator) or group (BPAC) to monitor the review process.

ASSESSMENT DISTRICTS
Different types of assessment districts can be used to fund the construction and maintenance of bikeway facilities. Examples include Mello-Roos Community Facility Districts, Infrastructure Financing Districts (SB 308), Open Space Districts, or Lighting and Landscape Districts. These types of districts have specific requirements relating to the establishment and use of funds.

IMPACT FEES
Another potential local source of funding are developer impact fees, typically tied to trip generation and traffic impacts as a result of proposed projects. In San Leandro, this fee is called Development Fee for Street Improvements (DFSI). A developer may be required to help mitigate the overall impact of vehicular trips by paying DFSI; the City should consider modifying the Municipal Code to clearly include bicycle and pedestrian improvements in the types of projects eligible to receive DFSI funds. This could be part of a larger Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program.
OPEN SPACE DISTRICT
Local Open Space Districts may float bonds that go to acquiring land or open space easements, which may also provide for some improvements to the local trail and bikeway system.

Non-traditional & Private Funding Sources
In the search for funding sources, it becomes increasingly necessary to ‘think outside the box’. With the climate change and health benefits afforded by walking and bicycling, there is an even greater opportunity to build partnerships with organizations and non-profits that have a similar interest in improving conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists. Teaming ventures with non-profit organizations will open up sources of private grant and foundation funding that is not open to a public agency.

CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS (CCC)
The program provides emergency assistance and public service conservation work for government agencies and non-profit organizations. Both urban and rural projects are eligible and selected on the basis of environmental and natural resource benefits and on-the-job training opportunities. The CCC would be effective at reducing project costs.

RAILS TO TRAILS CONSERVANCY (RTC)
The Conservancy assists rails-to-trails conversions through technical assistance, public education, advocacy, negotiations, legislation and regulatory action.

GRANT AND FOUNDATION OPPORTUNITIES
Private foundations provide excellent opportunities for funding specific capital projects or single event programs. Generally to qualify for these types of funds, a Bicycle Advisory Committee or established non-profit group acting in its behalf must exist. In general, private foundations are initially established for specific purposes, e.g. children and youth need, promotion of certain professional objectives, educational opportunities, the arts, and community
An excellent source of information about foundations and their funding potential can be found in the Foundation Directory, available at many public libraries or on-line at www.fconline.fdncenter.org/. Several foundations to consider are:

- Compton Foundation, Inc.
- Nathan Cummings Foundation
- Ottinger Foundation
- REI Corporate Contribution Programs
- Surdna Foundation, Inc.
- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
- Bikes Belong Coalition

**ADOPT-A-TRAIL/PATH PROGRAMS**

Modeled upon the Southern California program of highway maintenance contributions, this program would post signs to indicate which individual or group has contributed to the development, installation or maintenance of a particular bike facility. Trail construction can also be considered by school or civic groups as a year-long project.

**MEMORIAL FUNDS**

These programs are advertised as potential donor projects to be funded via ongoing charitable contributions or funds left to a particular project through a will. Most memorial projects include the location of a memorial plaque at a location specific to the improvement or at a scenic vista point.

**REVENUE-PRODUCING OPERATIONS**

As part of the development of a trail or bike path, plans can specifically include the location of a revenue-producing operation adjacent to the proposed improvement. For example, bicycle rental/repair facilities, food and drink establishments, and bike storage facilities would be appropriate uses. The on-going lease revenues from these operations could then be used for trail/path maintenance.

Even without a City owned/operated public-private partnership for such an establishment, providing low-stress bikeways that connect to existing or future developments can also increase local spending.
Appendix E: Crosswalk Practices & Priority Guidance

Scoring Criteria and Priorities:
Scoring criteria are developed to reflect the relative merit for improvements at a pedestrian crossing. In some cases, dependent on conditions, it may be sufficient to have only pavement markings and signing for one crossing while another crossing merits more extensive resources. The criteria includes influences from schools, vehicle traffic, vehicle speeds, pedestrian activity and other considerations which play a role in the merit for additional improvements at a crossing location.

A location which satisfies a particular criteria is not justification in itself for alterations and no duty is implied or presumed for the city to provide a marked crosswalk or enhanced crosswalk treatment by use of this guidance. It should be recognized there are limited resources for managing the transportation system for all users accordingly, and priorities for implementing new features or adjusting existing ones must be balanced with the needs citywide and assessed periodically by the City.

Staff recommended proposed scoring criteria to facilitate project periodization. In consideration of limited resources, a minimum score of 20 must generally be achieved by the sum of criteria. However, there may be certain limited exceptions to a lower threshold if found by the Engineering & Transportation Department to be in the interest of the overall prioritization process; for instance, coupling a candidate site with another nearby location as part of a CIP project. This minimum score of 20 may be adjusted up or down in the future by staff to reflect changes in resources and priorities. Once this threshold is satisfied, the subject site will be considered as a candidate for improvements together with other locations which also exceed this score threshold. Staff will then evaluate more subjective conditions such as community support, availability of funds relative to cost of improvement, engineering judgment of the site's safety, crosswalk study findings, or other considerations as deemed appropriate by staff.

PROPOSED SCORING CRITERIA

A. Elementary School 5, Middle School 4, High School 3 (max score 5); ______Score.

B. Travel lanes – 2 score for each through travel lane, 1 score for center turn lanes or median areas, 2 score where bike lanes and/or parking exist (max score value 10); ______Score.

C. Posted Speed Limit – 5 score for 35 mph or higher, 4 for 30 mph, 3 for 25 mph, 2 for 20 mph established school zone. The 85th percentile speed data may be used in lieu of posted speed at discretion of the engineer; ______Score.

D. ADT – Average Weekday Daily traffic below 10,000 vehicles is 0, 10,000 to 15,000 is 3 and above 15,000 is 5; ______Score.

E. Accident History (pedestrian/bike) – one non-motorized accident within crossing location in past 3 years = 5. More than one pedestrian/bike accident within past 3 years or a single fatality is score of 10 if determined to be clearly located within the crossing limits as determined by the engineer; ______Score.

F. Accident History (vehicle) – 2 score for 5 or more rear end collision (or other relatable collision not included in E. above) in past 3 years associated with activity from the crossing as determined by the engineer; ______Score.

G. Traffic Signal or existing marked crosswalk located within 500 feet of subject review location – deduct 5 score. Where traffic signals are within 300 feet of the crossing outside of the downtown district, flashing crosswalk systems will not be considered. Within the downtown district, this criteria may be overridden at the engineer’s discretion; ______Score.

H. Crossing is located on a designated arterial – Major is 5, Minor is 3, Collector is 2; Local Street is 0; ______Score.
I. Coordination. Project can be coordinated with another Capital Improvement Project, Grant Opportunity, Development, or Overlay project for efficiency in design and construction and reduced resource demand is 5; ________ Score.

J. Pedestrian volume of 20 peds or higher in peak one hour period is 5 score. Where 20 peds is not achieved for a crossing assign 0 score; ________ Score.

K. Site Conditions. This category allows the professional to assign up to 10 points for site conditions which are unusual, such as a side trail connection, or roadway gradient, or other aspect that in the opinion of the professional elevate the subject crossing beyond typical consideration; ________ Score.

L. Implementation Complexity. If the site meets criteria for installation or enhancement, satisfies certain community goals, and can be implemented relatively simply with minimal costs, staff time, or other resources as determined by the Department, assign a 5 score; ________ Score.

The City retains the right to remove or modify any enhanced treatment or marked crosswalk within the public right-of-way at its sole discretion and may from time to time develop pilot projects to evaluate new technologies and advances in crosswalk safety. The above criteria is developed by the Transportation Department staff and any interpretation of criteria or conditions rests with the Department Director or their designee.

In addition to the proposed scoring criteria, staff further recommend three draft Tier Levels that are an important strategy in helping to manage how and when improvements are made for pedestrian crossings given limited resources. Each Tier Level is briefly described below:

**Tier 1 – In progress (Current Design and/or Construction)**
This first Tier represents those crossing improvements which are currently either in design with known funding designated for the improvement or are pending construction soon.

**Tier 2 – Unfunded/ Un-resourced Priority Candidate**
The second Tier represents pedestrian crossings which have relatively high scoring and priority need with a general concept of improvement, but no funding or resources identified to further its design and implementation.

**Tier 3 – Vetting and Options Investigations**
The third Tier are sites which have merit for improvement but have not been fully vetted and may have various options to consider before improvements can or should be made. This Tier level may have sites that score relatively high but further investigation is necessary due to the need to develop the most cost effective strategy in accommodating pedestrians. For instance, can a segment of sidewalk improvement be made as part of another program that creates linkages to an already nearby established crosswalk?

Overall, it should be noted that although a scoring process is utilized, it is not used as a sole determining factor for decision making of which sites have the greatest priority. Its primary function is to assist in gaining a general sense of the merits of the crossing improvement relative to other sites. After the department team vetting exercises, there may be lower scored candidates which end up being assigned for immediate improvement if opportunities exist or other consideration necessitates such action.
Appendix F: Plan Update Public Survey Questions

San Leandro Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan Update Survey

Welcome! San Leandro is in the process of updating its Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. This survey will ask respondents questions about their travel choices to help guide the City in crafting this plan update. All information will be kept confidential.

Si requiere este información en Español, llame al Departamento de Ingeniería y Transportación al (510) 577-3428.

如果你需要中文版資訊，請致電510-577-3428工程與運輸部。
San Leandro Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan Update Survey

Travel Mode Choices

* 1. On a typical weekday, what modes of transportation do you use to get to work or school? Select all that apply.

- [ ] Personal motor vehicle
- [ ] Carpool
- [ ] Taxi/Ridesourcing (i.e. Uber, Lyft, etc.)
- [ ] Public transportation
- [ ] Bike
- [ ] Walk
- [ ] Work from home
- [ ] N/A
- [ ] Other (please specify)

*Specify your other mode(s) here: ____________________________*
2. How far away is your place of employment or school from your residence?
- Less than 1/2 mile
- 1/2 - 1 mile
- 1 - 3 miles
- 3 - 5 miles
- 5 - 10 miles
- Greater than 10 miles
- N/A

3. How often do you take public transportation (i.e. AC Transit, BART, LINKS, etc.)?
- Daily
- A few times a week
- A few times a month
- Rarely/Occasionally
- Never
San Leandro Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan Update Survey

Public Transportation

* 4. What is the purpose(s) of your transit trips? Select all that apply.

- [ ] Work
- [ ] School
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Shopping, errands, etc.
- [ ] N/A
- [ ] Other (please specify)
5. If you take the bus, how far away do you live from your stop?

- Less than 1/4 mile
- 1/4 - 1/2 a mile
- 1/2 - 1 mile
- 1 - 3 miles
- Greater than 3 miles
- N/A

6. If you take the bus, how do you currently get to/from the bus stop most often?

- Walk
- Bike
- Drive Alone
- Carpool/Get dropped off
- Taxi/ Ridesourcing (i.e. Uber, Lyft, etc.)
- Other (please specify)
7. If you take BART, how far away do you live from your station?
- Less than 1/4 mile
- 1/4 mile - 1/2 mile
- 1/2 mile - 1 mile
- 1 - 3 miles
- Greater than 3 miles
- N/A

8. Which BART station do you access most often?
- Bay Fair
- San Leandro
- Hayward
- Coliseum
- Other (please specify)

9. If you take BART, how do you get to/from your preferred station most often?
- Walk
- Bike
- Drive alone
- Carpool/Get dropped off
- Taxi/Ridesourcing (i.e. Uber, Lyft, etc.)
- Another transit vehicle
San Leandro Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan Update Survey

Walking and Bicycling in San Leandro

* 10. How safe and comfortable do you feel WALKING in San Leandro?
   - Very safe/comfortable
   - Safe/Comfortable
   - Neutral
   - Unsafe/Uncomfortable
   - Very unsafe/uncomfortable
   - I do not walk
11. What makes you feel unsafe walking in San Leandro?
12. If you do not walk in San Leandro, what is preventing you from doing so?
Walking and Bicycling in San Leandro

* 13. How safe and comfortable do you feel BICYCLING in San Leandro?

- Very safe/comfortable
- Safe/Comfortable
- Neutral
- Unsafe/Uncomfortable
- Very unsafe/uncomfortable
- I do not bicycle
San Leandro Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan Update Survey

Walking and Bicycling in San Leandro

14. What makes you feel unsafe bicycling in San Leandro?
15. If you do not bicycle in San Leandro, what is preventing you from doing so?

---

**San Leandro Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan Update Survey**

**Walking and Bicycling in San Leandro**

---
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San Leandro Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan Update Survey

Walking and Bicycling in San Leandro

* 16. Would you allow your child to walk/bike alone in San Leandro?
   - ○ Yes
   - ○ No
   - ○ N/A
   - ○ Other (please specify)

* 17. How secure do you feel your bicycle would be if parked properly on a bicycle rack in San Leandro?
   - ○ Very secure
   - ○ Secure
   - ○ Neutral
   - ○ Unsecure
   - ○ Very Unsecure
   - ○ N/A
18. Do you have any additional comments about walking and bicycling in San Leandro?
The following questions are confidential and will be used to ensure this survey reaches a representative sample of San Leandro residents.

* 19. What is your age?
   - Under 10 years
   - 10 - 19 years
   - 20 - 34 years
   - 35 - 54 years
   - 55 - 74 years
   - 75 years and over
   - Decline to state
* 20. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female
   - Other
   - Decline to state

* 21. What is your race?
   - White
   - Black or African-American
   - Asian
   - Latino
   - Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander
   - Some other race
   - Two or more races
   - Decline to state
22. What is your household income?

- Less than $25,000
- $25,000 - $49,999
- $50,000 - $74,999
- $75,000 - $99,999
- $100,000 - $149,999
- $150,000 or more
- Decline to state
23. Almost done! San Leandro will be continuing their outreach for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. If you would like to receive occasional email updates about the plan and learn about ways to stay involved, you can provide your email address below. Providing your email address is completely optional. Your email address will not be associated with your survey responses.

If you do not wish to leave your email address simply click done.
Page intentionally left blank.
Appendix G: Safe Routes to Schools Improvement Plans

Bancroft Middle School
San Leandro

Safe Routes to Schools Improvement Plan
Site Assessment held March 2017

1. **Callan Avenue / Parking Lot Entrance**
   - Stripe "KEEP CLEAR" in area in front of driveway and paint curbs red adjacent to driveway

2. **Bancroft Avenue / Callan Avenue**
   - Place planter to reduce tripping hazard at back of existing curb ramp
   - Upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks
   - Consider installing pedestrian scramble and illuminated no-right-turn blank out signs at northwest and southwest corners
   - Install green dashed bike lane markings at intersections, major driveways, and conflict areas on Bancroft Avenue

3. **Parking Lot Fence**
   - Add "No Pick-up or Drop-off" signage to parking lot fence

4. **Bancroft Avenue / Estudillo Avenue**
   - Install red curb at northeast side of Bancroft Avenue immediately adjacent to intersection
   - Install green 15 minute parking curb for 2 car-lengths to the north of red curb
   - Consider installing pedestrian scramble and illuminated no-right-turn blank out signs at all corners
   - Install high visibility crosswalks at all legs
   - Extend existing white curb on Estudillo Avenue east of Bancroft Avenue 3 car-lengths to the southwest
   - An R3-1 "No Right Turn" activated blank out sign should be installed facing WB traffic on Estudillo Avenue at Bancroft Avenue to prevent right turning movements onto Bancroft when students are using the pedestrian crosswalk. As a less-expensive interim measure, install an R10-15 "Turning Vehicles Yield to Pedestrians" or an R13A (CA) "No Right Turn on Red" sign

5. **Estudillo Avenue / School Frontage (Long Term Options)**
   - **Option A: Drop-off / Pick-up Zone:**
     - Using landscaping area from school, install a drop-off pull in for cars (getting out of the way of through traffic) where they can safely drop-off/pick-up or wait for their children. The pull-in should be designed with a continuous sidewalk along the back end connecting to existing path in the front of the school. The existing sidewalk along the street should also be re-designed, with special care given to the driveway crossings.
   - **Option B: Incorporate Teacher / Staff Parking into Future Development:**
     - As a part of the proposed redevelopment of this site, consider asking the developer to build/ allot a collection of parking spaces that school faculty and staff can use as a part of the development's community benefits package.

6. **Estudillo Avenue / San Jose Street**
   - Install high visibility crosswalk at west leg
   - Consider installing rectangular rapid flashing beacons at northwest and southwest corners
   - Install green dashed bike lane markings at intersections, major driveways, and conflict areas on Estudillo Avenue

The above items are recommendations only and based on Safe Routes to Schools site assessment best practices. Feasibility, determination of funding, and implementation of any recommended improvements is the responsibility of the appropriate governing agency.

Appendix G: Safe Routes to Schools Improvement Plans
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Garfield Elementary School, San Leandro
Safe Routes to Schools Improvement Plan
Site Assessment held April 2017

1. State Street / Aurora Drive / West Avenue 130th
- Install high visibility crosswalks at east, south, and west legs. Install School Assembly B Signage at Aurora Drive crossing
- Install curb extensions with updated accessible curb ramps at the southeast corner
- Replace existing school crossing sign with School Assembly B signage at the southwest corner

2. Aurora Drive / Northwest Corner of School
- Install R3-4 “No U-Turn” Signage on west side of Aurora Drive
- Discuss with Fire Department whether it would be appropriate to convert some of the red curb in front of the inactive driveway to white curb for loading/unloading

3. Aurora Drive / School Frontage
- Install green curb and R32D “30 Minute Parking” signage on southwest side of Aurora Drive (Limit restrictions to school hours)
- Install R3-4 “No U-Turn” Signage north of church driveway entrance on southwest side of Aurora Drive
- Install 20’ of red curb directly north of church driveway entrance on southwest side of Aurora Drive
- Relocate existing “No Left Turn” sign from northeast side of Aurora Drive at school driveway entrance to southwest side of street north of church exit
- Restrict left turns into school driveway entrance during drop-off/pick-up hours using cones as shown
- Update existing school assembly signs to current CA-MUTCD standard signs

4. Walnut Drive / Aurora Drive
- Install advance yield markings at northwest and southeast legs
- Install a curb extension at the northeast corner
- Install updated accessible curb ramp at northeast side of Aurora Drive
- Install high visibility crosswalk at southwest and northwest legs. Replace existing school crossing signs with School Assembly B Signage at Aurora Drive crossing

5. Marina Boulevard / Aurora Drive
- Install curb extensions at all 4 corners
- Install high visibility crosswalks at all 4 legs
- Existing crossing guard in place

The above items are recommendations only and not to scale. The actual locations and distances may vary. Preliminary recommendations were made, and in some cases, construction may occur as part of this project. Final design, funding, and implementation will be determined by the appropriate governing agency.
John Muir Middle School, San Leandro
DRAFT
Safe Routes to Schools Improvement Plan
Site Assessment held May 2016

1. Loop Area Parking Lot
   Install upgraded "No Student Drop-Off" signage on barricades erected by Safety Committee.

2. North Side of Williams St Near Crosswalk
   Install missing segment of red curb striping at sidewalk repair area.

3. Williams St / Castro St
   Install high-visibility crosswalk.

4. Williams St / Joyce Ave
   - Replace in-pavement crosswalk warning lights with brighter lights.
   - Consider upgrading the push buttons to an automated activation system.
   - In the long term, consider installing a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon or a Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon.
   - Install curb extensions across Williams St to prevent motor vehicles from veering into bike and parking lanes to avoid queue.

5. Williams St bridge over I-880
   Consider installing speed feedback sign.

6. Multiple locations (as indicated)
   Install CAM/UTCD-compliant school warning sign assemblies and pavement markings.
Non-infrastructure Recommendations
- Madison Elementary currently participates in Alameda County Safe Routes to School Program. Madison should continue to participate and take advantage of both the encouragement and educational programming that the Safe Routes to School Program has to offer. Special attention should be given to pedestrian-focused activities.

Proposed Improvements:
- Recommendations on City Property
  - Recommended High-Visibility Crosswalk
  - Recommended Curb Extension / Sidewalk
  - Recommended Curb Ramp
  - Existing Speed Feedback Sign
  - Existing Crossing Guard Location
  - Recommended Blocking of Driveway
  - Recommended Path/Gate
  - Recommended Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon

- Recommendations on School District Property
  - Recommended Advanced Stop Pavement Marking
  - Recommended Advanced Yield Markings
  - Recommended “Staff Only” Markings
  - Recommended Red Curb
  - Recommended White Curb
  - Recommended R26S Signage
  - Recommended R25D Signage
  - Recommended R24A Signage

Madison Elementary School
San Leandro
Safe Routes to Schools Improvement Plan
Site Assessment held April 2017

1. Willow Avenue / Juniper Street
   - Install detectable warning surfaces at all 4 corners
   - Install high visibility crosswalks at all 4 legs

2. Juniper Street / Staff Parking Lot Driveway
   - Install R26S signage along both parking lot curbs and at existing red curb at south side of driveway entrance
   - Stripe “STAFF ONLY” on driveway

3. Beechwood Avenue / Juniper Street
   - Install red curb and R25D signage on west side of Juniper Street where shown to establish school loading zone
   - Install high visibility crosswalk and detectable warning surfaces across Beechwood Avenue
   - Install advance stop markings at east leg

4. Juniper Street / School Frontage
   - Install R26S signage along both parking lot curbs and at existing red curb at south side of driveway entrance
   - Stripe “STAFF ONLY” on driveway

5. Purdue Street / Juniper Street
   - Existing crossing guard and speed feedback sign where shown
   - Install advance yield markings at north and south legs
   - Install high visibility crosswalks at north and east legs
   - Install accessible curb ramps at northeast and southeast corners
   - Install advance stop marking at east leg
   - Long-term: Study feasibility of installing Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons to replace existing flashing crossing sign

6. Juniper Street / School Parking Lot
   - Consider reorganizing the flow of drop-off / pick-up area to improve efficiency and increase the off-street queuing space for waiting vehicles
   - Existing speed feedback sign where shown
   - Install high visibility crosswalk across Manzanita Avenue
   - Install accessible path and gate connecting southwest corner of the school parking lot to Madison Playground

7. Bonaire Park / Madison Playground
   - Install accessible path and gate connecting Madison Playground to the Bonaire Park parking lot

8. Juniper Street / Sagewood Avenue
   - Install high visibility crosswalk and advance stop marking at east leg

9. Juniper Street / Hickory Avenue
   - Install high visibility crosswalk and advance stop marking at east leg

The above items are recommendations only and based on Safe Routes to Schools site assessment best practices. Feasibility and determinants of design, funding, and implementation of any recommended improvements is the responsibility of the appropriate governing agency.

Improvements not to scale
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McKinley Elementary,
San Leandro
Safe Routes to Schools Improvement Plan
Site Assessment held April 2017

1. Warren Avenue / E 14th Street
   - Install yellow transverse crosswalk across Warren Street
   - Install ADA-compliant curb ramps

2. E 14th Street / Estabrook Street
   - Install high visibility crosswalk across Estabrook Street
   - Install ADA-compliant curb ramp on northwest corner

3. E 14th Street
   - On east side of E 14th Street refresh existing and install additional white curb with accompanying R25D “School Loading and Unloading” signs. Near school driveway install red curb
   - On west side of E 14th install R3-4 “No U-Turn” sign

4. School Driveway / Drop-off Lane
   - Create “No Unattended Vehicles” signs and place along the lane
   - Restrict parallel parking along portable classrooms
   - SHORT TERM Solution: Create a pedestrian path with pavement markings and bollards/vertical delineators to create a space for safer passage along the lane
   - LONG TERM Solution: Relocate the portable classrooms to create a drop-off zone and move the fence to create additional parking

5. E 14th Street / Blossom Way
   - Install curb extensions on the two western corners
   - Install rectangular rapid flashing beacon on northern crosswalk across E 14th Street
   - Install advance yield markings on E 14th Street and advance stop markings on Blossom Way
   - On the northeast side of E 14th Street, consider installing a bus bulb for loading/unloading

6. Blossom Way / Bancroft Ave
   - Install curb extensions on the northwest and northeast corners
   - Install high visibility crosswalk across Blossom Way
   - Install advance yield markings on Bancroft Avenue
   - Install R9-3bP “Use Crosswalk” sign on southwest corner of McKinley Court and Bancroft Avenue to direct pedestrians to Blossom Way marked crosswalk
   - There is an existing Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon at this crossing

7. Bancroft Ave
   - Install red curb, for both the bus zone and driveway visibility
   - Install green curb with accompanying R32D “30 Minute Parking” signs
   - Install an access gate on the south side of the field to provide a pedestrian path to the school
San Leandro High, San Leandro
Safe Routes to Schools Improvement Plan
Site Assessment held April 2017

Non-Infrastructure Recommendations:
- Continue to participate in the Alameda County SR2S program to benefit from their pedestrian and bicycle program resources.
- Regularly instruct students where and how to cross. Ensure parent or staff volunteers monitor during drop-off and pick-up.
- Regularly remind parents/guardians of the available options for pickup and drop-off. Remind them there is no stopping along red curbs or red bike lanes. Encourage them not to perform U-torns where not permitted and not to double park to load/unload their student. Provide reminders in a newsletter at least two times per semester, and email brochure for all drivers.
- Expand available secure bike and skateboard parking to encourage additional students to commute using those modes.

San Leandro High School

The above items are recommendations only and should not be construed as a substitute for formal design or construction plans. Final design, engineering, and implementation of any recommendations are the responsibility of the appropriate governing agency.

1. Bancroft Ave and Blossom Way
   - Install curb extensions on Bancroft crossing
   - Install high visibility crosswalk on Blossom crossing
   - Install advanced yield markings on both sides of the Bancroft crossing

2. Thomas Ave / School Grounds
   - Restripe staff parking lot

3. Thomas Ave / School Grounds
   - Install additional secure bike, scooter, skateboard parking
   - Existing bike parking is always at or near capacity

4. Bancroft Ave / School Entrance
   - Paint the curb green at the center of the school entrance
   - Install R32D "30 minute parking" signs along the length of the newly painted green curbs
   - School staff should encourage drivers to move forward and enforce no parking in the loading zone

5. Bancroft Ave / Student Services Building
   - Move the existing crosswalk 100 feet to the northwest
   - Install advanced yield markings on both sides of the crosswalk
   - Paint the curb red
   - Widen sidewalk at the driveway near 136th Ave

6. Bancroft Ave Between School and 136th Ave
   - Assign parking spaces in the Southwest lot for students and staff
   - Install vertical delineators along the double yellow centerline to prevent left turns
   - Install R3-2 "No Left Turn" sign. Update R3-2 time to reflect school schedule
   - Install R3-5 "No Stopping Bike Lane" sign at beginning of red curb on the South side of Bancroft Ave
   - Use vertical delineators on the school side bike lane
   - Install Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons on the northwest crosswalk. Add two advanced yields on Bancroft Ave
   - Install high visibility crosswalks at northwest, northeast and southwest legs
   - Install additional secure bike, scooter, skateboard parking

7. 136th Ave Between Bancroft Ave and E 14th St
   - Install R3-4 "No U turn" sign midblock

8. 138th Ave Between Bancroft Ave and E 14th St
   - Install high visibility crosswalk and accessible curb ramps at 137th Ave
   - Install R7-9 "No Stopping Bike Lane" sign at beginning of red curb on the South side of Bancroft Ave
   - Narrow lanes to 10 feet and install a 2 foot buffer to the bike lane
   - Install Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons on the northwest crosswalk. Add two advanced yields on Bancroft Ave
   - Install high visibility crosswalks at northeast, northwest, and southwest legs
   - Install additional secure bike, scooter, skateboard parking

9. E14th St Between 138th Ave and 136th Ave
   - Install R35D "School Loading" signs along the white curb
   - Paint the curb white for school loading area
The above items are recommendations only and based on Safe Routes to Schools site assessment best practices. Feasibility recommendations, design, community input, funding, and implementation of any recommended improvements is the responsibility of the appropriate governing agency.

**Washington Elementary School**
**San Leandro**

**Safe Routes to Schools Improvement Plan**

**Site Assessment held April 2017**

**East 14th Street / Dutton Avenue**
- Install high visibility crosswalks at all 4 legs
- Ensure that future intersection updates support bike and pedestrian safety with elements including curb extensions and pedestrian countdowns

**Dutton Avenue / Holman Court**
- Install transverse crosswalk at southeast leg

**Dutton Avenue / Euclid Court**
- Install high visibility crosswalk at southeast leg
- Install transverse crosswalk at northeast leg
- Install 20’ lengths of red curb on northwest side of Dutton Avenue adjacent to crosswalk
- Install advance yield markings at either side of Dutton Avenue crosswalk
- Install high visibility crosswalk across Maple Court
- Consider curb extension at southeast corner of Dutton Avenue and Maple Court
- Check visibility of stop sign on northwest side of Dowling Boulevard north of crosswalk
- Install high visibility crosswalk at north leg of Breed Avenue and Dutton Avenue

**Dowling Boulevard / Breed Avenue**
- Install 2 sets of advance yield markings at northeast corner where shown
- Install R9-3BP “Use Crosswalk” signage at school frontage (sign should face building)
- Long Term:
  - Consider squaring off the intersection of Breed/Dowling/Dutton to reduce conflicts and improve visibility
  - Consider removing Breed/Dowling slip-lane to reduce conflicts and improve visibility

**Breath Avenue / School Frontage**
- Install R3-4 “No U-Turn” signage along Breath Avenue
- Install white curb where shown and install R25D “School Loading and Unloading” signs. Open the gate along Breath Avenue during arrival and dismissal times
- Consider sidewalk markings or detectable warning surface at accessible parking driveway to warn pedestrians of vehicles entering and exiting the accessible parking area

**School Zone**
- Upgrade existing school zone and School Assembly signs on Dutton Avenue and Dowling Boulevard to current CA-MUTCD standards
John Muir Middle/Wilson Elementary School Safe Routes to School Improvement Plan

1. **Joyce Avenue at Williams Street**
   - Move SLOW SCHOOL XING stencil closer to the crosswalk across Williams Street.
   - Replace existing pedestrian warning signage with fluorescent yellow-green Assembly B and Assembly D signage.
   - Consider installing curb extension on southwest corner of Joyce Avenue to increase visibility and pedestrian space.

2. **Dolly Avenue at Williams Street**
   - Replace existing pedestrian warning signage with fluorescent yellow-green Assembly B and Assembly D signage.
   - Consider installing curb extensions at mid-block crossing to increase pedestrian visibility, discourage illegal parking, and increase pedestrian space.

3. **Wayne Avenue at Seeley Street**
   - Replace existing pedestrian warning signage with fluorescent yellow-green Assembly A and Assembly B signage.
   - Evaluate options for traffic calming on Wayne Avenue north of the intersection.
   - Install curb ramps at school driveway.
   - Install pedestrian-activated advance warning beacon for north-bound traffic.

4. **Williams Street**
   - Deploy speed feedback signs along Williams Street to discourage eastbound vehicles from speeding.

5. **John Muir Middle School Grounds**
   - Coincident with parking lot resurfacing, install curb ramps at driveways, and restrict left turns from exit driveway.
   - Coincident with parking lot resurfacing, widen sidewalk.

6. **Wilson Elementary School Grounds (Wayne Avenue Parking Lot)**
   - Coincident with parking lot redesign, construct sidewalk or path to provide pedestrian access to school grounds that is separated from motor vehicle traffic.
   - Conduct targeted enforcement at Wayne Avenue entrance.
   - Work with City of San Leandro and Police to train crossing guards and/or parent safety patrol for Wayne Avenue entrance.
   - Equip crossing guards with vests and stop signs.

7. **Other**
   - Work with AC Transit to consider shifting schedule to accommodate school trips from southern San Leandro.
# Appendix H: CA Streets & Highways Code 891.2 Compliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Section(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Commuters</td>
<td>The estimated number of existing bicycle commuters in the plan area and the estimated increase in the number of bicycle commuters resulting from implementation of the plan.</td>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Uses &amp; Activity Generators</td>
<td>A map and description of existing and proposed land use and settlement patterns which shall include, but not be limited to, locations of residential neighborhoods, schools, shopping centers, public buildings, and major employment centers.</td>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing &amp; Proposed Bikeways</td>
<td>A map and description of existing and proposed bikeways.</td>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing &amp; Proposed End-of-Trip Facilities</td>
<td>A map and description of existing and proposed end-of-trip bicycle parking facilities. These shall include, but not be limited to, parking at schools, shopping centers, public buildings, and major employment centers.</td>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal Facilities</td>
<td>A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transport and parking facilities for connections with and use of other transportation modes. These shall include, but not be limited to, parking facilities at transit stops, rail and transit terminals, ferry docks and landings, park and ride lots, and provisions for transporting bicyclists and bicycles on transit or rail vehicles or ferry vessels.</td>
<td>Chapters 1 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes &amp; Shower Facilities</td>
<td>A map and description of existing and proposed facilities for changing and storing clothes and equipment. These shall include, but not be limited to, locker, restroom, and shower facilities near bicycle parking facilities.</td>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Education Programs</td>
<td>A description of bicycle safety and education programs conducted in the area included within the plan, efforts by the law enforcement agency having primary traffic law enforcement responsibility in the area to enforce provisions of the Vehicle Code pertaining to bicycle operation, and the resulting effect on accidents involving bicyclists.</td>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>A description of the extent of citizen and community involvement in development of the plan, including, but not limited to, letters of support.</td>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination With Other Plans</td>
<td>A description of how the bicycle transportation plan has been coordinated and is consistent with other local or regional transportation, air quality, or energy conservation plans, including, but not limited to, programs that provide incentives for bicycle commuting.</td>
<td>Chapter 1 &amp; Appendix A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Section(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Prioritization</td>
<td>A description of the projects proposed in the plan and a listing of their priorities for implementation</td>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Expenditures &amp; Future Needs</td>
<td>A description of past expenditures for bicycle facilities and future financial needs for projects that improve safety and convenience for bicycle commuters in the plan area.</td>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>